

17/1

Vol. 17 : No. 1. JAN. 1973

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

GANDHI  
MARG

ABDULLAH / MULK RAJ ANAND / A. APPADORAI / V. BALASUBRA-  
 MANIAN / CHINAI / DURGA DAS / DIWAKAR / FERNANDES / D. K.  
 GUPTA / MAHTAB / MALKANI / MANKEKAR / SHRI RAM NARAYAN  
 RADHAKRISHNA / RUTHNASWAMY / MANUBHAI SHAH / S. SHUKLA  
 K. SUBRAHMANYAM / C. SUBRAMANIAM / KRITZER / RAM RATTAN

## IN BACK NUMBERS

**1987**

**January**

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism  
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic  
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference  
P. Nagendra Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Ahimsa

**April**

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd  
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance  
Jerzy Sawicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research  
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

**July**

Martin Luther King : The Casualties of the War in Vietnam  
John R. Rater : The Concept of Detachment  
R. R. Dheskar : Gandhi and Man in Evolution  
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

**October**

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi  
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love  
Kareem Monsour and Martin Grotjahn : Racial Prejudice and the Intest Taboo  
T. V. Parvate : Tilak and Gandhi

**1988**

**January**

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities  
Mama B. Byline : Truth is God  
Jagadeeksh Nereyan : The Outlook for Peace in India  
Rolph David Abernathy : Religion and World Peace

**April**

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare  
Bo Winmark : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence  
T. K. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation  
Noam Chomsky : The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste

**July**

Maurice Friedman : Martin Luther King An American Gandhi and a Modern Job  
Melford Q. Sibley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution  
Stuart Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign  
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

**October**

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence ?  
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?  
H.J.M. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impotence  
R. R. Dheskar : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

SANDHI MARG  
SANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

# GANDHI MARG 64

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER ONE JANUARY 1973

Editors

G. Ramachandran

T. K. Mahadevan

APR 1973

Editorial Board

R. R. Diwakar

J. B. Kripalani

Jayaprakash Narayan

Abid Hussain

Vijayl Hari

G. Ramachandran

Shrinani Narayan

Bhavani Prasad Mishra

Radhakrishna

Devendra Kumar Gupta

T. K. Mahadevan (Convener)



# Contents

|                    |    |                                     |
|--------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| Editorials         | 1  | Long live Rajaj                     |
|                    | 3  | The growing dilemma                 |
| Symposium          | 6  | India 1973: Some crucial questions  |
| Herbert M. Kritzer | 53 | The military as a target of protest |
| Ram Rattan         | 84 | The anatomy of Gandhi's aniyogtha   |

Rs. 3.00 a year in South Asia ; \$ 2.50 elsewhere : postfree. Rs. 3.00 (\$ 1.00) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates : 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Complaints about non-receipt : (inland) within 15 days, (foreign) within 30 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money orders only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 231-734, Datta Deyal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi and printed by him at the Kaveri Printing Press, New Delhi. (Library of Congress Card No. 59-47394)

## Editorials

---

### LONG LIVE RAJAH

With the passing away of Chakravarthi Rajagopalachariar, the last giant of the gandhian era has left us. But even among these giants Rajaji held a unique position. It was a most astonishing phenomenon that he remained closest to Mahatma Gandhi for an unbroken period of fifty years and yet, more often than any other leader of India, distanced from him and even sharply differed on occasions from the great Master. Curiously, Gandhi loved and trusted him, the more Rajaji distanced and went on his own way. This was possible only because Gandhi never even for a moment doubted his sincerity, courage and truthfulness. Gandhi also, while giving the utmost consideration to Rajaji's views, would go his own way leaving Rajaji to work out his own destiny. But distrust and separation occurred only rarely, even if, on very vital issues. But most of the time Rajaji never questioned the leadership of Gandhi. He did so because he too believed that Gandhi was the bravest, the most truthful and the most selfless of leaders. Thus the bond between Gandhi and Rajaji stood every strain and challenge of India's political revolution which brought India from bondage to freedom.

Let no one weep or sob that beloved and revered Rajaji has passed away. Conventional words, spoken or written, would be totally inappropriate on this occasion. Rajaji lived longer than any of our leaders. He died at his ninety-fifth year. There never was a fatter, richer, nobler and dedicated life than Rajaji's. People looked at the simplicity of his life, and thought he was an ascetic. The truth was his life was radiantly variegated and he was at heart a supreme artist of life. He loved music and literature, painting and architecture. He was deeply immersed in the beauties of Sanskrit, Tamil and English literatures. Strangely, this man of religion and philosophy was a great admirer of Bernard Shaw. Even in the stress and strain of politics, he was a care-worn pecking his way with profound care through the labyrinth of events and personalities. Rajaji the writer will be more immortal than Rajaji the politician.

One look at the glorious record of his life will in itself be an education. A brilliant speaker, writer, valiant social reformer and fighter for freedom, a magnificent conversationalist, a deep devotee of God in the best sense of the word, he took the whole of life as a spiritual challenge and always met the challenge, fearless and truthful.

There were many glaring contradictions in his life. They only proved that he was not a slave to consistency. He reacted to changing conditions in utterly unexpected and different ways. This is not the time to go into that story. But underneath his contradictions was a passionate and throbbing love of India and the Indian people and an unquenchable thirst to serve them to the best of his ability. Even his dearest and closest friends sometimes stood aghast at the contradictions in his life and work. But not one of them doubted his sincerity or rectitude. That was why his enemies were sometimes his best friends and his best friends continued to trust him in spite of everything which appeared baffling.

There has rarely been in our history a leader more respected by opponents than Rajaji. There was the arch-heretic S. Ramaswami who differed from Rajaji on many matters but who testified that he had no other guru except Rajaji. The Marxist Communist leader Sankaran Namboodripad wrote recently that he differed from nobody more than he differed from Rajaji and yet there was no leader in the Congress he respected more than Rajaji. This is something unique in the history of India that even the acutest political differences did not matter and that in spite of them Rajaji was universally admired and trusted. I think it was the late President John Kennedy of the U.S.A. who said of him that he had seldom met a person who had a more civilizing influence on him than Rajaji. Pandit Nehru grew to like and admire Rajaji greatly. In fact, Pandit Nehru is bidding goodbye to Rajaji as the Governor General of India, admitted openly how much he was drawn to him.

Rajaji occupied some of the biggest places in the public life of India and yet he ever remained simple and unostentatious till the very end. He never lost the common touch. He had an uncanny understanding of men and women. It was the late Jammalal Bajaj who said of Rajaji that the man was yet to be born who could deceive him. His large dark eyes would probe into the souls of men and women. He was long called the Gandhi of South India. It was he who brought khadi into the lives of millions. It was he who took the poison of caste and untouchability out of the hearts of millions. It was he who took away the thirst for liquor from the mouths of millions of people. It was he who put the love and fear of God into the minds of millions. It was he who demonstrated that the lowest among men had the right to dissent from the greatest among men. He was thus a fearless pro-

phet of dissent, but he showed also to millions that dissent and reverence can go hand in hand. His Tamil writings will live as long as Tamil lives. As a thinker he penetrated into the heart of every problem. He lived such a life for ninety-five years. That is why no one should weep he has passed away. Let us rather weep for ourselves that we are unworthy of him. Let us rejoice that such a man lived in India, that we could see him, hear him and know him.

The tributes that have come pouring from the ends of the earth show how his greatness had come to be recognized far beyond the frontiers of India.

Such a man cannot die. Death loses its meaning when applied to the passing away of such a man.

*Long Live Rajaji!*

G. RAMACHANDRAN

## THE CROWNING DILEMMA

Although the Symposium that follows this article, and which is the main highlight of this number, deals with problems, it is perhaps more precise to say that what we are confronted with in this country—and indeed elsewhere in the world—is a succession of dilemmas. The difference between a problem and a dilemma is not certainly the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, it is a qualitative difference. A problem oriented approach is not only needlessly plain, it tends to be weighted towards fact-finding. This scapegoat-hunt (as one might call it) leads not to the solution of problems but to the setting up of a Rogues' Gallery. It does often succeed in demonstrating, with much finesse, a direct causal relationship between problems and the men (or women!) responsible for them. Having done so, however, the scapegoat hunters rest on their oars, leaving the problems to fester in neglect and the rogues to stew in their own juice. Ironically enough, this is the stuff of which politics in our country is largely made.

The dilemmatic approach, on the other hand, does not look for scapegoats. It does not assume that things have got to be either black as coal or white as snow. Rather it recognizes that the situation in which men and societies find themselves is more in the nature of a quandary, admitting of several solutions or no solution at all. A man who perceives a dilemma for what it is, is a humble man. He is not a man in a hurry.

He points no accusing finger at another. He is never the one to cast the first stone.

New Gandhi was such a man. A politician to his fingertips, he nevertheless worked with dilemmas rather than with the customary polarization of problems and solutions. His perception of human dilemmas was acute to the point of agony. Not for him the easy way of tracing each difficult situation to some individual locus of power. He did not end his days—days of bitter anguish for him—pointing an accusing finger at Nehru and Patel. He did not throw a spittoon in the works—as he well might have done—when the infant Indian Government woke up to discover that the first item on its agenda was a war on the western front. It is Gandhi's followers who talk of violence and nonviolence as though these are mutually repellent qualities. Gandhi saw deeper.

What then is the precise nature of India's ailment? What is its aetiology? Is it a compound of several causes or can we, by a process of simplification, reduce it to a single, pervasive cause? Or will such means end up in narrow?

Let us take a leaf from Gandhi's own book. He saw long ago—long before he turned on the Indian political scene—that the essential human dilemma was simply the *dilemma of excess*. There are not words that he used himself, but the implications of his message are plain as a plumbline. Excess is the hallmark of modern civilization, even as austerity is the hallmark of its ancient (especially Indian) precursor. Indeed they are two different kinds of civilization. Gandhi weighed them both, and having done so he had little hesitation in rejecting the excess, the indulgence and the ambition.

Monist that he was, Gandhi saw that the antithetical excess with which man is threatened is his excessive technology. Man has ever been a tool-maker and a tool-user. Man's tools be anything. Without them he would have long ago vanished from the face of the earth. (By tools we do not obviously mean the hardware alone but also such brilliant innovations as language.) But when his tools grew in power, it was paradoxically man himself that diminished. In the result, modern hyper-technology is very like Aladdin's lamp: it will give us everything we want except keep us our own masters!

Now one of the (questionable) blessings of technology is that it has enabled man, without let or hindrance, to scatter his seed around—so that the day is not far off when the earth will be peopled not by countless varieties of flora and fauna but almost exclusively by his own spawn. Old-fashioned naturalists, hearing of such a prospect, would turn in their graves. Innumerable species have bowed out when their populations exploded beyond a critical number. Will man too vanish from the scene of his screaming offspring? Not he! He is too adaptable, too flexible, too cunning. And don't forget his tools. All that he need do is develop a



technology of survival and he can go on and on. If the earth is too full he can colonise Jupiter and the furthest galaxy. Besides he has the unique capacity of living on words and other such unsubstantial things!

The crowning dilemma then, let us say for India, is that a country which might have supported, with some semblance of decency, three hundred million people, already finds itself saddled with almost double that number and is well on its way to reaching a billion before the end of the century. What can any government—socialist, capitalist, gandhian or other—do in such a situation? In an aid-weary world, or where for good reasons old sources of aid are fast drying up, whence will India find the wherewithal to feed, clothe, house, educate, employ and entertain—defining these in the barest terms—such a teeming lot of people? In any case, what kind of a socialist utopia (or gandhian ramayana) can conceivably be built upon an anthracite?

Obviously, what we have on our hands is not a problem for which a solution might be found or, alternatively, a scapegoat who could be nailed on the cross, what we are faced with is a dilemma. The acquiring of this perception is the first step.

To resolve a dilemma is not as easy as it is to solve a problem or to pillory the Establishment—any Establishment. It is a process which lies beyond the pale of politics and ideology. Or using the example of Gandhi, one might say that it is politics of another kind and order—though we trouble to say this, seeing that the gandhian brand of politics has so far had but a poor ratings.

What then do we do? Where do we go from here? Every signpost that we see is turned in the direction of disaster. Since we can neither halt nor turn back, is there any other option but to lean against the nearest signpost and curse the cost of our farther journey?

This cost can be briefly stated: (a) With its substance progressively eroded, the shell of democracy will fall apart, leaving in its train a new and elusive form of technological authoritarianism; (b) the barricades between the elite and the have-nots will grow increasingly invulnerable, with the latter reduced to a state of impotent frustration and living in a fantasy of expectations; (c) with the punitive powers of the state enlarged beyond recall, the last flicker of revolution will be finally extinguished.

What more can one or need one say?

T. E. MANMADHAN

# *India 1973: Some Crucial Questions*

---

## A SYMPOSIUM

SHAIKH ABDULLAH

MOLE DAS AKAND

A. APPADURAI

V. BALASUBRAMANIAN

SAMIRRAJ M. CHINAI

DURGADA DAS

S. R. DWIVAKAR

ARCHDEACON FERNANDES

DEVENDRA KUMAR GUPTA

HAREKRISHNA HANTAR

E. R. MALEKANI

D. R. MANICKAR

SERMAN NARAYAN

RADHAKRISHNA

M. RUTHERFORD

MANURAJ SHAN

S. SHUKLA

K. SUBRAMANYAM

C. SUBRAMANIAM

## PROSPECTUS

- ☐ The perception of problems is as important as the formulation of solutions. An unperceived problem has a way of throwing ideas into disarray by surfacing when least expected. A misperceived problem often reduces the effectiveness of planning. A problem perceived in the wrong order leads to much national waste.
- ☐ This symposium is thus Janus-faced. It lists no problems. Rather it asks contributors to look both ways: to identify the problems as well as to provide the answers.
- ☐ In the nature of things, an exercise of this kind has to be selective. Not simply for reasons of printing space. Problem solving is essentially a continuing process. Otherwise politicians and planners would soon be out of business.
- ☐ What is the precise purpose of this symposium? Not certainly to build up a roster of the multitudinous problems bedeviling our

national life. Not indeed to provide everyone a chance to exhibit the particular bee in his bonnet.

- ☐ Rather, the symposium is actuated by the belief that, given the framework, the perceptual spectrum is bound to be narrow, with most contributors asking and answering the same kind of questions.
- ☐ The phrase 'India 1973' is not intended to be restrictive. But in an age of galloping change, India can no longer afford to think and plan timelessly. Even long-term planning is already prehistory.
- ☐ Contributors are asked (a) to identify three major issues facing the country; (b) to argue why, in their view, these are crucial; and (c) to set forth ways of resolving them.
- ☐ These 35 years without Gandhi have seen many fateful changes in our country. But the shape of things to come in the next 25 years boggles one's imagination. Contributors may therefore also, if so disposed, examine relevant gandhian insights which are serviceable in the resolution of contemporary problems.

## PROGNOSIS

### *Sheikh Abdullah*

The three major issues facing the country, in my opinion, are: (1) building up of the national character; (2) internal peace and stability, and (3) foreign relations. Let me take these issues seriatim.

Character has always played a significant part in the rise and fall of nations. No country has been able to preserve its independence without building up its national character. India has suffered long periods of slavery during which her national character has received a great setback. The country has achieved its independence after a long and hard struggle. Therefore, building up the national character ought to have received the first priority. This should have been done by completely overhauling the educational system, and thereby building up a new nation. But despite many efforts it has remained a dream. The idealism with which the country fought the battle for freedom and independence has completely disappeared. Power and money have become the main objectives of life, no matter how they are achieved. This has badly eroded the character of the nation.

One is reminded here of the great Latin maxim, 'mens sana in corpore sano', which means 'a sound mind in a sound body'. In order to build up a sound nation, it is necessary to take care of the development of the mind and body of the coming generation, and make available to it adequate medical attention by providing a curriculum incorporating

themselves both the physical and mental needs of the youth. The education and health of the nation must, therefore, receive top priority. Unfortunately, this is not being done. These two portfolios are not considered to be as important as others in the scheme of the Government, the result being that several plans which were drawn up and got ready to usher in a sound educational system according to the requirements of the country were not implemented either for lack of adequate funds or interest. Similarly, enough effort has to be made to improve the health of our growing generation. A healthy body is a happy companion to a healthy mind. Most advanced countries devote very great attention to the development of the youth, both physically and mentally. But unfortunately, here in India this has not been done. A well-planned educational system catering both to the mental and physical development of the youth would go a long way in building up a sound nation.

Secondly, no country can make much progress in its developmental efforts without internal peace and stability. Unfortunately, India has not been able to create such an atmosphere in the country during the last 23 years of its independence. On the contrary, we have been witnessing distressing scenes of disagreement between the rulers and the ruled and severe conflicts between different sections of its population. The only way to improve this situation is by providing effective protection to the life, property and freedom of every citizen of India, without discrimination of caste, creed or religion, in order that he may pursue his normal avocation and feel that he too shares equally with others the responsibility and power that come from building up the country and taking it forward. It is then alone that he will willingly identify himself with the interests of the country and share her joys and sorrows.

Thirdly, the question of India's foreign relations, more particularly with her immediate neighbours. From the points of view of both area and population, India is the second biggest country in Asia. Therefore, psychologically, her small neighbours would look at her with suspicion in regard to her intentions towards them. This is the price that every big country in the world has to pay. But it should not provoke in her an attitude of retaliation. On the contrary, it should always be her endeavour to convince them of her good and friendly relations, adopt a most liberal attitude in resolving the mutual differences and points of friction, if any, and try to establish close economic co-operation. Such a policy alone will serve the long-term interests of India. Our foreign relations should never be influenced by emotions and personal likes or dislikes, nor should India adopt a big brotherly attitude towards her neighbours. This will create more fear and more suspicion towards her and will drive the small neighbours to seek protection somewhere else which may, in the long run, prove detrimental to her national interests and, to a great extent, hinder her developmental efforts.

*Mulk Raj Anand*

In a time of the decay of faith, such as the present, it is not possible to revive the old philosophies of our country, which were essentially built on devotion.

Under the changed circumstances, when the need for the integration of a dominantly rural society into our agro-industrial order is urgent, it becomes necessary to evolve some new hypotheses, such as may become the basis for a new ethos. Perhaps the inner core of Gandhi's teaching, which was derived from the inner urges of the Indian people, may percolate into a new pattern in this way, in so far as his propheticisms have relevance for the new period.

Thus it becomes necessary, in the next few years, to work out some concepts towards a new philosophy of life for our people, before we can address ourselves to the priorities of a pragmatic program for regeneration.

The premises of this new thought were already put forward before our country by Gandhi, Tagore and Nehru, in the miscellaneous ideas towards the worship of Man, through securing for him basic plenty, as well as the opportunity for growth and integration. This philosophy of Humanism was not defined exactly by any of the three lay thinkers, but it is nevertheless implicit in all our approaches to life.

In our own contemporary period, the resurrection of this concept has taken the form of important initiatives by Mrs Indira Gandhi, in many ways heir to the vitalist teaching of all the three spokesmen for Indian humanism.

Among the various initiatives Mrs Gandhi has taken, the reception of ten million refugees from Bangla Desh, in spite of the poverty of our own people, and the liberation of Bangla Desh through police action, demonstrates her will to transform the situation of political weakness into one of moral courage. And in this, as in her slogan of 'Garibi Hatao', she has demonstrated her faith in the capacity of men to make themselves.

If this ethos could be reinforced by new initiatives, it is quite likely that the intense urges of the bulk of the people towards solidarity would be objectified.

I think that there are three values which could be emphasized during the next few years to make the transition from the vague atmosphere of doom-day, which has been created through natural and other calamities in India, to leading its people towards a more radiant future.

(1) The 'Garibi Hatao' program must begin to involve the people from the village upwards. The centre of administration must be enlivened by a personal appeal from Mrs Indira Gandhi to begin work-

ing far, and with the people, rather than rule them through a bureaucracy. The voluntary welfare associations, specially from big towns and small towns, should do mass contact at the grassroots level. In this way could the Nehruvian program of a well, a school, a road and electric light in every village be actually realized by individuals and organisations of the better-off sections adopting a village for regeneration. The energies of the rural masses, in the transition period, must flow into those agro-industries which are nearer the rural communities and not into fields of technology beyond their education. And the production of food, cloth, handicrafts and small-scale industries must be made the basis of growth, which may then be diversified into the major industries in the metropolises.

(2) The education system must be revised, reorganised and reorientated towards a vocational bias at all levels. For instance, apart from the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in Agriculture from the great universities, we really need the kind of school where neo-literate may be able to learn three or four agro-industries, beyond farming. These neo-literates may take to comprehensive farming rather than drift into the town slums. And, unlike the graduates, they may stay on the land rather than go into offices. Again there is scarcely any provision in our redundant education system for imparting literacy, technical education and General Knowledge to workers and peasants and the lower middle classes. There are many colleges for producing millions of unemployed graduates. The B.A. or M.A. degree is considered a status symbol, and not as part of the making of an individual into a dynamic human being, integrated into a new kind of social order different from the societies of the West. The emphasis of education must, then, be tilted towards the great mass and not be concentrated only on the middle sections.

(3) Our goal should be development towards the year 2000. Free India must advance towards helping the survival of man all over the world, rather than merely plan in terms of our own nationhood. The basic propositions of our foreign policy during the liberation struggle and after have been towards internationalism. Jawaharlal Nehru's Panch-Sheel defines the philosophy of brotherhood and not mere regionalism. The implications of this doctrine, in spite of its failure after Bandung, are still relevant in the relationships we must cultivate to help make the Indian Ocean an area of peace. Also, in spite of the European Common Market and the UNCTAD recalcitrance, we must initiate political, trade and cultural relations with all countries of the world, beginning, of course, with our neighbours in the Far East, South-east Asia and Africa. This implies that our friendship with Russia must become the model for our contacts with other countries, with whom we unanimously share one important preoccupation—that

of a hundred years' peace and no Third World War. Such alliances would naturally force one per cent disarmament during the next five years on the super powers, redefine the concept of 'standard of living' of the West, and usher in the era of basic plenty for which mankind is longing as against the consumer's goods luxury productions based on over-technology.

In this context, we should bring our natural sense of hospitality to bear on our attitude to all those people who are opting out of the overfed, expensive, money-mad civilization of Europe and America and wish to come to share poverty and active labour with us. This would mean showing an example of lack of racial discrimination and other prejudices, which still dominate the so-called advanced economies. Before this is possible, we must of course root out our caste discriminations.

We must encourage all those men and women of good will, in our ashrams, schools, universities, and the lay society, which can make India a polyglot, casual united nations area, which may be comparatively less violent than the old and new nation states, proud of their frontiers with the rigid passport and visa systems.

I have not read anything yet about the funds necessary for our development. But we can, by ruthlessly destroying the parallel black-market economy, secure them by demeritization. We must make production by every individual, and the fruits thereof, the basic bedrock of our departure into a new era, as China has done. There can be no recovery unless the blackmarket economy is finished for ever.

Also, there can be no future for India unless the parent of every fourth child is taxed, abortion made legal, and population control made a great deal more effective. Neither God nor Mrs Indira Gandhi can help India if our present population growth is not checked.

#### *A. Appadorai*

The Editors have set a challenging task before their contributors to identify three major issues facing the country, to argue why, in their view, these are crucial; and to set forth ways of resolving them.

I shall be content with identifying one major issue.

In my view, the single crucial question which we must begin to tackle at once—though it may take generations to be solved adequately—is the moral crisis in our national life. There is clearly a lack of social conscience in the individual, a lack of consideration, in his actions, for the interests of others, and this adversely affects the fulfilment of our objectives in our economic, political and educational planning.

To illustrate: according to authoritative reports, a substantial portion of our economy is regulated by black money; the growing rate in

prices of commodities is not justified by the admittedly scarce supply of commodities, and is attributable to profiteering by traders and hoarders; public sector enterprises, by and large, are not working as satisfactorily as they should and the innumerable strikes and lockouts result in a large waste of manpower.

In the political sphere, defections by members of legislatures from one party to another for personal advantage, widespread use of political power for personal gain (the reports of inquiry commissions in Bihar and the Punjab are clear evidence); delay and corruption in the conduct of public business; unbecoming conduct of legislators in several legislatures, the part that caste plays in elections; steady deterioration of law and order and destruction of public property by those who defy authority (as was evidenced recently in the Telengana-Andhra conflict over the *amla* rules) are ample proof of the lack of social conscience and the moral crisis in the nation.

In the social sphere, communalism, casteism and lack of social mobility illustrate the moral crisis. The frequent occurrence of communal riots—which, from all accounts, have increased in number since independence—and the continuing prevalence of untouchability, notwithstanding the directives of the Constitution and the law of the land to the contrary, are facts known to us all. The limited social mobility, arising partly from casteism and communalism, leads to wastage of a vast human potential, there again impeding the creation of conditions favourable for the most able and dynamic people at all social levels to come forward and get ahead.

In education, the moral crisis is there for all to see. Student apathy, often, if not always, for trivial things; garbage, the 'unpardonable' of the Vice-Chancellor of a University and the assassination of the Vice-Chancellor of another University by students, the burning of buses by them; mass copying at examinations, the steady deterioration in the work done by teachers at all levels and the fall in the standards of education have only to be mentioned and need no elaboration.

Above all, liberty has turned into licence. In a famous passage in the *Republic*, Plato wrote that in a democracy all things are just ready to burst with liberty: 'The son is on a level with his father, he having no respect or reverence for either of his parents . . . the master fears and flatters his scholars and the scholars despise their masters and tutors; and the young man is on a level with the old . . . and the honest and the just have a way of marching along with all the rights and dignities of freemen and they will run at anybody who comes in their way if he does not leave the road clear for them.' Have we reached this stage in our democracy?

It is necessary to stress that the moral crisis in our national life, the lack of social conscience, the absence of individual discipline, is a



crucial issue? The fact that it is all-pervasive and affects all aspects of our national life is itself significant. I will, however, myself raise a query and try to answer it. Is not lack of consideration for the interests of others—selfishness, if you please, the grabbing for money and power—only an offshoot of economic insecurity and inequality which, therefore, must be considered the crucial issue? There is some justification for this viewpoint. For can men, living in economic insecurity, ignorance, squalor and disease be expected to display a concern for others' interests when society displays, according to them, such scant regard for their minimum requirements in food, shelter, clothing, health and education? Hence Swami Vivekananda and Gandhi expounded the cause of the *daridranarayan*, the down-trodden. The point is that the moral crisis and the economic malaise are interlinked, and an improvement in one is bound to have a beneficial impact on the other. It is, indeed, pointless to argue which is the greater evil. But one justification for giving pride of place to the moral crisis may be stated. The lack of social conscience is found not only among those who live under conditions of economic insecurity, economic inequality and unemployment, but among the possessing classes, the class who have economic and political power as well.

Now briefly to solutions. I suggest two.

The foregoing analysis will have indicated that economic growth is of course one solution, as other writers in the symposium are certain to deal with this, I desist from taking space here to develop this point. I should like only to say here that self-sufficiency in food for the nation is priority number one. And in attempting this gigantic and essential task, adequate place must be given to small-scale and medium irrigation works—wells, tanks, tube wells; these must not only be constructed but maintained; food supply must not, any longer, be a gamble on the monsoon.

The second solution is the planned development of a cadre of social workers—attached to nationally recognised social service institutions like the *Seva Neta Sangh*, the *Servants of India Society* and the *Ramakrishna Mission*—who will, by their dedicated service, give a tonic to national life. I have in mind, ultimately, a million social workers trained and controlled by the three institutions mentioned above and spread all over the country, in villages as well as in towns; we may start with a target of one hundred thousand. Here Gandhi's insight is BOM useful. In his last political testament, written on 27 January 1948, he wrote: 'The Congress has won political freedom, but it has yet to win economic freedom, social and moral freedom. These freedoms are harder than the political, if only because they are continuous, less exciting and not spectacular. All-embracing constructive work evokes the energy of all the parts of the millions . . . On its own register it

(the Congress) will have a body of servants of the nation, who would be workers doing the work allotted to them, from time to time. . . . These servants will be expected to operate upon and to serve the voters . . . in their own surroundings.' The Congress did not heed the Mahatma's advice; the constructive work of moral regeneration he envisaged remains to be done.

The State or a political party cannot, by its very nature, do the work of moral regeneration. That is why I have suggested that the three national social service organizations must take upon themselves the unfinished task. A blueprint of how organized social work can be done effectively needs to be prepared. Briefly these trusted organizations, working according to moral standards, have to recruit between them, to start with, say, a hundred thousand social workers; the necessary finance must be provided by the State; the work of the Christian missionaries in India and elsewhere shows how devoted social work can be planned, organized and implemented with success. The workers should not be expected to renounce the world or shun the normal amenities of life. By living among the community, in villages and towns, they will set an example of dedicated life, by manning key positions in voluntary organizations, cooperative societies, trade unions, panchayats and the like, they will help to purify public life, help citizens to shun conduct which must be avoided and to observe rules of conduct which will help to achieve public good in the best sense of the term. A million men in our devoted army help to protect the country against foreign aggression; a hundred thousand men in our social army—to start with—should help to save the country from moral degeneration.

### *V. Balasubramanian*

To me the most important public issue for the year 1973 is whether the nation is going to cry halt to the proliferating cancer of corruption which is eating into the vitals of politics, business and the services. It is now an open secret that illegal money circulates freely among ministers and officials of high or low degree and obtains illegitimate favours for businesses, big or small. Close even are these relatively comfortable days when it was possible for the citizens, in their innocence, to assume that money, black and bad, was revenged or coerced in a big way into party coffers and, incidentally, into the pockets of fund-collecting ministers or their benevolent headmen, only during election time. Graft has become as normal a feature of public affairs in our country as inflation is of its economic affairs.

Given this wide prevalence of corruption in politics, business and government, much of the development or welfare programs financed out of public funds and most of the massive apparatus of controls, allegedly

maintained for regulating the economy in the public interest, have simply become a gigantic hoax or fraud on the people. Perhaps the most intolerable aspect of this impossible situation is that the citizens of this country have become listless or feel helpless about it all.

Not a day passes, it is true, without agitations or demonstrations, which often turn violent, but they are invariably protests against the symptoms of the disease, which is the grievous setting of standards or values in politics, business and administration. Prices indeed are rising; shortages, obviously, are spreading; unemployment, no doubt, is growing; and the poor still hug their poverty, while the rich continue to live in a world of their own. But how many of us realise that all this is happening, not because politicians do not know how to run a government, officials are incompetent in administration or businessmen inefficient in commerce or industry, but simply because private greed has suppressed a sense of accountability to the public at all levels of politics, business and the services? Or, knowing that this is so, how many of us have come forward to do something about it, at least to the extent of talking about it? And when I say this, I do not mean the talk that goes on by way of gossip along the cocktail circuit—of this there is an abundance, of course; I mean talking openly and furiously, with fire in one's belly.

Possibly I am too pessimistic. There is, after all, currently, in Tamil Nadu, a movement come to surface against corruption in government and public life. The people, it seems, do care and their patience, presumably, is not infinite. But then, granted that the heart of the public is still sound, how has the so-called class been using its head? Given the way this movement is being conducted, or its meaning or implications are being stirred over by those who claim to be leading or guiding public opinion, including the gentlemen of the press, it seems to me that there is every danger of a popular protest against a public evil being prevented from blossoming into a cleansing national crusade (which, having started, so to speak, at Kanyakumari will duly extend to Kashmir) and, instead, being allowed to get lost in the petty manoeuvres of power politics. Had Gandhi lived, he would have died to ensure that the people's sense of outrage triumphed.

With 1972 having given expression to a fierce outbreak of regionalism, through a violent agitation over the 'malki rules' in Andhra Pradesh, I am naturally led to wonder whether the fire of parochialism will burn even more destructively in the year ahead. I am not concerned here with the merits of the 'malki rules' controversy; there is always much to be said on either side in such debates. What interests and alarms me here is that we have had yet another demonstration of the creeping paralysis of national disengagement to which our body politic seems to have fallen prey. The Andhra people are not by any means the lost sinners,

nor are they even the worst sinners. In Maharashtra and, latterly, in West Bengal, it has become a policy of the state government concerned to treat people from other parts of the country as second-class citizens for purposes of employment, whether in government offices or in private firms. If other states have not been behaving this way, it is not because the people or the politicians in those states are more enlightened, the difference, simply, is that they do not so far have a problem in this respect. For instance, not many people move from Maharashtra to Madras City in search of jobs nor from West Bengal to Kerala.

Gandhi united India in the freedom struggle. He would not have wished to see an India independent become a house divided against itself. He foresaw, perhaps, that what would immediately happen to a poor people, if frustrated in their aroused expectations of material wellbeing, was a loss of their sense of kinship among themselves and that every Indian, in such circumstances, would see all other Indians as competing with him and with one another in a struggle for survival. Gandhi, no doubt, had a whole personal philosophy of life to be pitted against the gospel of the machine age. I suspect, however, that he also had a shrewd feeling that a program of industrialization that failed to live up to the false promise of painless material progress would be a great divider of the Indian people.

Finally, will 1973 see some abatement of the resentful frustration which seems to be poisoning the psyche of the student world? In Gandhi's scheme of things, the men and women of the younger generation were to be the great liberators. He saw them as a flow of evolutionary harmony linking the past to its future. He knew that the older generation had its uses, but he was wholly conscious that the younger generation had the right to use the older. It was not for nothing that those grand field armies for his non-cooperation campaigns came so spontaneously from the ranks of men and women in the twenties or early thirties of their lives. It was, again, not incidental to Gandhi's sorrow over the schools of violent political action that they distorted youth's perspective of what freedom ought to mean for India or what must follow that freedom for the good of the India of tomorrow.

Today not many in positions of influence or authority in public life seem to care very much what use the young have for a future or what use the future may have for the young. This is both a cause as well as a consequence of the younger generation losing confidence in the older and the latter losing confidence in itself. The Five Year Plans, whether they have done anything else or not, certainly seem to have interminably distracted our vision of historic time. In a literal way this country has come to live from day to day; and Gandhi, now dead for 35 years, is being gathered more and more into a non-past in a country which is finding it increasingly difficult to believe in any future.

*Babubhai M. Chinai*

It is only a quarter of a century since one of these great figures of history, who lived with us, spoke to us, taught us the way of civilized living, has passed away. A whole generation has grown without knowing his live presence, save the homages paid to the Mahatma now and then by the older people. Even they seem to have forgotten his message. If we go by results, who can deny the moral constricting of politics? How can anyone ignore the violence of language and even physical violence that mark our society? There is considerable talk of new perspectives, new priorities, new attitudes and new assessments. Yet there seems to be no understanding of what we are evolving towards.

Gandhi had said, 'I have nothing new to teach the world. Truth and nonviolence are as old as the hills.' This was characteristic of a noble soul. Indeed his philosophy is comprehensive and covers all aspects of life. In these days when it is fashionable to talk of change, we overlook that Gandhi was a practitioner of change. He was a rebel in the truest sense of the term. He fought British imperialism as much as Indian traditionalism. In the economic field, his basic philosophy lies in the fact that he questioned the relevance of the western model of development to Indian conditions.

He began the exploration of the specificity of Indian conditions and the intellectual quest for an economic and social model which takes cognizance of Indian conditions. We must be wise enough to recognise that the Mahatma represents the beginning and not the consummation of this quest. Of enduring value in Gandhi's thoughts is his perception of the basic problems of Indian society rather than his prescriptions for their solution. The basic point is that his fundamental perceptions and insights have relevance not only for the period to which he belonged but also for the present and future situations in India.

Let us now look at the essence of Gandhi's economic thought. Gandhi's first important contribution was to throw light on the rural-urban cleavage, the vast gulf between 750,000 villages and a few hundred towns in India. He was emphatic that the one-sided development of town-based modern industry may have only adverse effects on the village. It was bound to accentuate the existing hiatus between urban and rural areas. He also emphasized that in India, for a long time to come, it was neither desirable nor feasible to promote urbanisation.

His second contribution was to draw attention to the preponderance of the small working peasants and artisans in the total population, as a logical corollary. Gandhi also drew attention to the vast importance of small scale agriculture and traditional handicrafts in the livelihood patterns of the overwhelming majority of the Indian people. In his view, a development model which did not give adequate importance to the im-

improvement of small scale agriculture and handicrafts, in effect gave primacy to the interests of a narrow minority at the expense of the interests of a vast majority. Above all, he stressed that modern industry would do more harm than good to these vast masses if it was not deliberately so planned to avoid encroaching upon the sphere in which small scale production was dominant.

The third basic contribution was to fix attention on the conditions of labour surplus in the Indian economy which made it irrational to intensify the application of labour-saving technology for expansion of output. It was both rational and desirable to seek maximisation of output through utilisation of surplus labour in small scale capital-and-labour-saving enterprises. An economic model based on surplus labour utilisation, in his view, would contribute simultaneously to the growth of output as well as mass welfare.

Even though the architects of our Five Year Plans did make concessions for some of Gandhi's ideas which spoke of the participation of small peasants, artisans and the landless labour in economic development, and provided for the development of small scale industry and agriculture, in effect the identification of economic progress with the development of heavy industry never permitted any serious and comprehensive operational planning for the realisation of these goals. As a result, significant progress has doubtless been achieved where it was a question of the development of a modern industrial sector or the creation of a modern sub-sector in agriculture, but as predicted by Gandhi, these developments, by and large, have failed to make a perceptible dent into mass poverty and unemployment. This situation is the root of the social tensions which have become a chronic feature of Indian society today.

The contributions of the Mahatma are of enormous significance for economic development. He rightly anticipated that in our overpopulated and agrarian society, the need for economic improvement of the masses for a long period lies along exploitation of the economic potential of family-labour in agriculture and small industry. He was also constantly on the look-out for land and capital saving technology for both agriculture and industry which help the maximisation of both income and employment. The recent advances in land-saving agricultural technology, which have held out the promise of economic efficiency of small operating units, have proceeded in a direction anticipated and desired by Gandhi.

In evaluating and assessing Gandhi's thought, it is necessary to bear in mind that he always insisted on making a distinction, and rightly too, between material advance and real progress. The affluent western world is slowly realising this truth. As a sociologist has said, 'Gandhi was a unique blend of Luther and Calvin in the Indian society'. Like Luther,

he had a deep distrust of the rising forces of materialism. Like Calver, at the same time, he made a heroic effort to reinterpret religious thought to the changing circumstances of the modern period.

If we hesitate to base our economic program, with such adaptations as may be necessary, on the gandhian philosophy, we shall be doing no more than sow the seeds of self-destruction. The corruption of character will be no less complete than the spoliation of the physical environment.

### *Durga Das*

It is only appropriate that, true to its name, *Gandhi Marg* should invite writers in the twenty-fifth year of Gandhi's martyrdom to identify three major issues facing the country and suggest their solution, if necessary by using gandhian techniques.

Let me first state that corruption in public life is no longer the evil it was known to be during the Gandhi era.

Immorality is no longer immoral in an increasingly permissive sexual life. The lust of power and its extreme to satisfy greed and lust (three Ws) are no longer a disqualification for public office; indeed today they are considered to provide the zest for it. Labour is not the criterion for reward. In all this gandhian values may be said to have been thrown overboard.

But the picture even in its general outline will be incomplete without putting on the credit side three other parallel developments. Firstly, women who were sucked into public life by the call of Gandhi have become a growingly significant element in our public life. This is not only symbolized by the fact that a woman holds the country's Prime Ministership but also by the manner in which women are entering every sphere of public life and the more waterlogged among them are repurting the question of sex morality from orthodox notions of chastity.

Secondly, the 'Gandhi Hates' (Eradicate Poverty) slogan has created a new consciousness among the have-nots. Although it is taking on the appearance of class war it is also instilling a spirit of tolerance among the haves and a sense of self-criticism among the 'vulnerable' sections of our society.

Thirdly, the people have become conscious of the fact that an end to the clash between the haves and the have-nots and also the solution of the problem of poverty will have to be found, in the final analysis, by adopting the 'Gandhi Marg' (The Way of Gandhi)—which can be simply defined as *Sarvodaya*, the good of all. Gandhi wanted every public worker to win the confidence of all sections of the community which love alone could secure. He did not subscribe to the all too common view that the good of the people meant the good of the majority. It is the enforcement of this unjust doctrine that has confronted American

democracy with the challenge of Black Power and with the contradiction that while Americans, constituting a sixth of the world's population, own half the world's wealth, no less than 27 per cent of their people live below the poverty line!

There is hardly an evil in modern life, be it in a capitalist, communist or fascist state, which does not exist today in the public life of this country and in the personal behaviour of our citizenry. All this evil may be summarized in one dictum, 'Each one to himself'—each picking the other's pocket, each telling the other a pup and each resorting to lies and ruses to promote his personal interests alone. Perhaps the evil may also be named in modern idiom as image-building. A politician does it one way, a cinema star another way and a whore a third way. The point to be stressed is that the evil of image-building is universal. It places self above society, the community, the nation and humanity at large.

It can be argued that if every individual is engaged in self-improvement or self-fulfilment it should total up to a better world than the one in which there are masters and slaves, haves and have-nots, the mighty and the downtrodden. Yes, the struggle for survival does create a movement leading to an upheaval and humanity, in the final count, benefits by such a changing of the scene.

All epics, including the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, illustrate the situation in which India and the world at large find themselves. Violence and terrorism is daily recorded in all parts of the world excluding India, so also discoveries of science and technology. We also have a lot of people, westerners in particular, in search of gurus. There is a general feeling that old religions, their precepts and their rituals do not quench the thirst of the modern man and woman for a freer, fuller and more meaningful life.

The politician thinks he is meeting the challenge by uttering mouthfuls of slogans and employing a series of gimmicks, the businessman and the trader feel they are playing up to the seller's market by multiplying their wares by fair or foul means; the petty official thinks he is helping himself and his clients by charging a fee for services rendered; the top executive thinks he is serving himself and the nation by exploiting the market; the politician assumes he is doing nothing wrong by taking a cut in gains he helps businessmen to make and the public official to pocket.

All this is a tale of selfish behaviour. There is no such thing as law and order, honesty in dealings between man and man or commitment to labour for earning one's living. It may be said that if this goes on there would be chaos and life and living would be impossible.

The fact is that the people of the world, and certainly of India, have learned to co-exist with poverty, tyranny and corruption. The common people theoretically still value honesty, simplicity, godliness, social service



and humanness. But they model their behaviour on that of others who are on the higher rungs of the ladder.

There is no democracy in India because our rulers have built their appeal on caste and catered to the egotistic impulses under a feudal order. There is no socialism because the current philosophy is based on the 'Heads I win and tails you lose' mentality. There is no law and order because the establishment sets a bad example by breaking it in its own interest. And the consequence is the raj of the goondas and the hoodlums.

Modern India was blessed with a *triumvirat*—the Gandhi-Patel-Nehru Triumvirate. All three are dead but they have left an imperishable legacy. Gandhi taught love and truth. Patel showed how human beings must discipline themselves to fulfil the godhuan message. Nehru crusaded against false gods and images and named new gods—science, technology and the agitational concept. We thus have in them the creator, the preserver, the destroyer—all three are an inseparable part of our heritage. If only researchers would make a primer of the thoughts of this modern triad we would successfully fight the triple evil of corruption, maladministration and self-aggrandisement.

### *R. R. Diwakar*

Four socialist dreamers dreamt about free India, each in his own way. The dreams were not inconsistent with one another, nor were they contradictory. Perhaps the four together gave a grand conception of an India that can be, could the dreams but be shaped into reality—not by a magic wand, but by realistic vision combined with imaginative adjustment, and hard solving by India's millions for practical results.

Lokamanya Tilak who passed away in 1920 made India aggressively vocal in the demand for *Swaraj* as a birthright. He formed what was called the Democratic *Swaraj* Party at the end of his days. He and his followers wanted India to be as free as England, and as democratic as Britain in their sheltered island.

Sri Aurobindo, though a contemporary of Tilak, wanted India to be free not merely as any other country, but for rising to its original and earlier spiritual heights and to be the Gauri of the world. He aimed at a synthesis by India of the two emphases of east and west, on spiritualism and materialism, and in the bargain, taking the next step in human evolution, thereby raising man to super-manhood, not of the Nietzschean brand but one which could be truth-conscious, love-inspired and with power to transform even matter to higher and subtler levels. He pointed to Integral Yoga as the path.

Gandhi wanted India not to follow the West in its mad rush after materialising the needs of the sensate man. He would follow the line of the

ethical man and not that of the ever-expanding economic man, who would perforce be an exploiter of man and nature. He aimed at raising the level, physical, mental and moral, of rural India that is the real India, more than anything else.

Jawaharlal Nehru wanted India to be modern in every sense of the term and could not imagine how India could live and progress without being industrialised in the accepted sense of the term. Big factories, hydro works and such other things were the new 'temples' which were calculated to bring prosperity and peace to India and the world. He gave the slogan 'Democratic Socialism', that is, economic growth at a rapid pace with social and economic justice as a necessary concomitant, but all this to be achieved by democratic methods of the western type.

Tilak's dream has come true, practically in toto. Sri Aurobindo's dream requires a far longer time to materialise. Freedom has come as a result of putting into vigorous practice the kind of non-cooperation he envisaged in his political will and testament as early as 1916, when he chose to go to French India and concentrate on the practice of Integral Yoga.

Thinkers and philosophers in the West are now being impressed by the spiritual content of Indian thought and practice. Paramahansa Yogananda, Vivekananda, Ramana Maharshi, Swami Shivananda, Chattanya Mahaprabhu and Sri Aurobindo himself are being studied more and more. The physical and vital aspects of Yoga are normally most attractive to the West. It is only recently that meditation, the most important aspect of Yoga, is being attended to under the influence of Paramahansa Yogananda, Maharshi Mahesh Yoga and others. But one thing is clear, that the importance of human consciousness and its control for reaching higher levels is now being realised more and more in the West. That way lies real human evolution and not through science and technology as understood in a limited sense, and as confined to the realm of physics and chemistry, with the test-tube as the main instrument and the laboratory as the temple.

Gandhi is today being studied both in India and abroad as a counter-balance to the modern trends of over-industrialisation, pollution, alienation, violence, urbanisation and so on. His emphasis on rural India still occupies the minds of the planners in our Government. But his modest economics, his ethics, his faith in God and his greater faith in the masses, his ideas of planning from below and at the grass roots, his simplicity, his nonviolence—these do not seem to attract much attention. The policy of prohibition he advocated is yielding to the lure of easy excise revenue which governments get at the cost of sobriety and the economies of the poor man. The techniques which he evolved during the struggle for freedom are being used without the essential controlling factors of truthfulness, honesty and the strictest possible nonviolence to

thought, word and deed. His aim at a classless and classless society is being negatived by a number of things; political power is often enough pursued on the basis of religion, community and caste, and elections bring up casteism as an important factor for success. There is a cold war raging between employers and employees and it has converted itself into a struggle for power instead of only for economic benefits. All the planning has merely made the rich richer, and the poor poorer. Unemployment and backwardness have increased no doubt, but the extension of the period of privileges has created a vested interest in backwardness. The movements of Bhootan, Qalandan and others in the gandhian tradition have made a psychological dent, no doubt. But the problems of land and village politics have not changed very much except in some areas. A newspaper reader in India may feel that there is no rural India at all, as all news pertains to towns and cities.<sup>1</sup>

As regards modernisation, India is certainly modernising fast and the twenty-five years of independence have seen many significant changes in that direction. Whether one likes all the features of modernisation or not, we are in an escalator. The globe today is like a single ship afloat or a satellite set going round the sun with 3600 million passengers—and they have to be able substantially with some local variations. India may require another quarter of a century to industrialise and urbanise as much as Japan or Germany but the trend is unmistakable and perhaps the course is inevitable. It was not merely Jawaharlal's fancy that he thought of modernisation. He was with the times and saw early enough that it was inevitable—of course, with such restraints as were necessary and such variations as were dictated by Indian traditions and conditions.

With all these things behind and before us, what are the social problems that we are facing? Seventy per cent of our people are illiterate. We cannot boast of being a modern people with this load of illiteracy, with no tool in the hands of the people to know what is going on all around. Forty per cent of our people are below the poverty line, that is, they are living on less than twenty rupees a month. There is a poverty line in U.S.A. also, but the line there means two thousand rupees per month—only one hundred times more than India! And the number of such people in U.S.A. is estimated to be not more than ten per cent, whereas it is forty per cent here! Nothing less than a mighty national effort, not merely by the Government but by the whole people, inspired by an intense awareness among the educated and those who have, to share their knowledge and wealth with others, can be a remedy for this other physical and mental poverty.

Apart from the drought situation in some areas this year in India, the problem of unemployment and under-employment is acute. Decentralisation of industries and promotion of labour-intensive industries and works in rural areas seem to be the only remedy. But here again, the

awareness of duty and responsibility as well as the simple principle of 'no wages without work' and without adequate production, has to be realised by each individual as well as by the community as a whole. All other remedies can be defeated by lethargy and non-awareness of these responsibilities.

The whole Indian scene, no doubt, looks rather confused and difficult to handle. But we must remember that all the dissatisfaction and the insistence of every action to have its pound of flesh is due only to two things: First, the new awakening among the high and low of their real or imagined rights and the absence of the equally important sense of duty and responsibility that must precede the fulfilment of all rights. Secondly, the want of realism and of the realisation that adjustments are necessary for living together. Both these imperatives must fuse together into a philosophy of life for Indians if they wish to continue as a nation among nations.

### *Archbishop Fernandes*

Richer for the experience of last twenty-five years, India's hopes for the 'seventies are bright and real, though the challenges remain as mighty as ever. Notwithstanding our failings, weaknesses and difficulties—wars, drought, famine and floods—much has been accomplished since independence, especially in the fields of industry, agriculture, social welfare and education. Our policy of non-alignment has been proven and we have demonstrated in five General Elections that the democratic process is viable for our 335 millions.

The spirit of India drew the respect and admiration of the world when in a magnificent act of human solidarity, she came to the rescue of ten million refugees from Bangla Dosh, even as she helped that country in the battle for freedom.

Our Silver Jubilee Year has ended with the promise of a durable peace on the sub-continent and 'a feeling', in President Giri's words, 'that a new era of goodwill and friendly relations among the nations of the world has opened'. However, assets and achievements must not blind us to our liabilities and stubborn problems—rising prices, growing unemployment, political chaos, poverty, illiteracy and a decline in the growth of industrial output.

### OUR IDEAL: INTEGRAL HUMANISM

The foundation of our national life, says the Preamble of the Swamiji Statement on National Integration, is a common citizenship, unity in diversity, freedom of religion, secularism, equality, justice—social, economic and political—and fraternity among all communities. That in a word is Integral Humanism—the foundation for a full human

life for each man, the whole man and all men in the country.

It means a greater sense of belonging—both to our fellowmen and to our country and her destiny. There is need for a greater spirit of compassion and unselfish service, combating the greatest social evil haunting us today—unemployment, the terrible perpetrator of poverty, discrimination and exploitation. To achieve this goal of integral humanism, there are four areas calling for disciplined attention: (1) economic growth; (2) social justice; (3) people's participation; (4) self-reliance.

#### ECONOMIC GROWTH

The GNP has more than doubled in the past decade and so too the area brought under irrigation. The green revolution, though it has received a set-back in 1972, is still a workable reality. And yet, notwithstanding the Five Year Plans, we are far from economic self-reliance, and may well wonder whether some re-thinking is not called for at this stage.

Some experts ask whether in a country where capital is scarce and labour plentiful, employment should not be made the target of planning and overall growth its byproduct? If big urban factories and large-farm mechanised agriculture must continue to be encouraged, does this preclude active attention to small producers in farming and many categories of industry? The poor can certainly pay the cost of their own improvement, as can be gauged, for example, from the strong rates of the small farmers in Taiwan. The human effort needs to be supplemented, not replaced, by reliable machines.

Similarly, capital intensive industries are needed in a large country like ours, but side by side still greater stress could perhaps be given to small industry—the more so as the amount of capital needed to increase production in this way is limited.

Consistent with our goals of non-alignment and social justice, should not the private sector also be more significantly encouraged along the above lines? Increased production must certainly be given a big boost in the 'seventies'.

#### SOCIAL JUSTICE

The distribution of GNP is greatly influenced by the manner of its production. If GNP is produced by many, people in general will share in the material benefits of economic growth, whereas if it is hoarded to a few, the gap between rich and poor will continue to widen.

Our aim should be to become a fully employed economy. Income distribution must be embedded in growth policies. That half of India's population which owns only four per cent of the land and can lay claim to less than a rupee a day for their needs will only be able to have faith in the 'Garibi Hatao' program when they themselves are bringing a

about

## PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

This 'sense of community' as a nation is necessary as the justifying moral unit of development, even as it highlights another important issue, namely, people's participation in the development process, their sharing in production and in its fruits and in the power to make the decisions that matter. Preserving law and order is one thing, bringing about the development needed in the country is another. Our administrative system could certainly do with some streamlining suited to our post-colonial needs. Abolishing the zamindar was a blessing to the harassed poor, but has not the contractor or some other middle-man effectively replaced him? The bottlenecks operative at various levels of the administrative machinery are not tributes to the spirit of 'service' expected of those especially who live on the taxes of the people. Production often suffers because a worker does not experience any job satisfaction and that in turn is due to his having no say in what is produced, its subsequent marketing and his lack of purchasing power to bring any sizeable benefit to his family from what he produces at work.

## SELF-RELIANCE

Self-reliance can only come about along the above lines when development becomes a movement of the masses. Some hard political decisions need to be taken so that there is real freedom and joy in work in all sectors of life not excluding the university. If the lure of money and the greed for power continue to keep millions of the work force in a state of effective subordination, the prospects for self-reliance grow dimmer. The educational system needs to be overhauled so that the types it can produce are not hireable self-seekers or just skilled workers at the mercy of others, but people who know the meaning of responsible living, their rights and duties in society, the need for responsible parenthood and family life education, people who are concerned about the one million destitute in the country, the poor and the underprivileged whom they consider it a privilege to serve.

The school and college system must be geared to generating this social consciousness even while it imparts training for individual betterment and moral values.

This brings us to the vital question of motivation and the re-making of man. The world is all right; it is man who is in crisis in our country.

*Student indiscipline*, for instance, is only the manifestation of a generation denied mental and moral training, encouraged in disorderly behaviour by the present conduct of examinations and the role of some unscrupulous mercenaries therein, the disregard of ethical principles in practical life by grown-ups, the grant of material success to persons of

doubtful academic standards, the expediency of politicians—or administrators-turned-educationalists. Nothing is more urgent than 'the discipline' necessary for modern development, for that combination of knowledge of technique and the ability to apply it in a human context demanded by the challenges of life today.

Drawing on the heritage of the past and harmonising it with the best the modern world has to offer, we can and must move ahead confidently to the future. It is in and through the blend of the wisdom of the seers, the motivation and dynamism latent in all the religions in our land, the culture of the philosophers and artists, the courage and integrity of the heroes of our freedom struggle, the true grittiness and selfless spirit of Gandhi and Nehru and the expertise of the technocrat, in a word, it is through the integration of authentic religious and ethical values with science and technology that India has a real contribution to make to the betterment of her citizens and to the world at large.

Gandhi's appeal to his countrymen is as telling today as it was when he uttered it two days before his death. 'Each of us should turn the searchlight inward and purify his or her heart as much as possible. You should think how best to improve yourselves and work for the good of the country.'

### *Devendra Kumar Gupta*

Like any other country on the world map, India is maddled with multi-faceted problems. The dark shadows of its problems show more markedly in the early hours of the rising sun of 1973. Of these, the three most important seem to me to be; (1) The law and order problem. There is pandemonium in many quarters and tension is mounting at various points. Due to diverse causes a general feeling of stress prevails. (2) There is a great depression, psychologically, because of the gap between peoples' aspirations and achievements not having been bridged. Both in the rural as well as the urban sectors the picture of the underprivileged is very bleak. (3) We are passing through a crucial stage in our relations with other countries and there is a lurking danger of India getting isolated amidst the changing equations of the political equilibrium of the world.

#### POLITICAL PROSC

Firstly, there is the law and order situation in the country, i.e., the problem of unrest that is evident everywhere and which erupts into conflagration now and then. Crystallising at the moment in the geography of unrest are the issue of Telangana in Andhra Pradesh, the tussle between the DMK and the Anna DMK in Tamilnadu, students' unrest in the campuses of the northern universities, and the problems resulting from

the continued struggles between political parties and groups in all the states. All these and many more are symptoms of a deep-seated malady in the structure of our society. Its basic cause could be traced to the political process of decision making based on majority. The criterion that democracy is to be judged by the security it provides to the minority hardly finds expression in these days of competitive political struggles. Unless, therefore, a method is found to make the democratic system rise above the rule of artificial majority, the situation is going to be no better than what it is today.

The Indian electorate is not so docile and uneducated as it is made out to be. It does react against, and register its needs about, the various pulls and pressures that are brought to bear upon it by the political cross-currents which sweep the country. From 1947 onwards the masses of India have tried out diverse experiments in the pattern of the ruling group; and by all accounts such experimentation will continue to proceed forward. This is a healthy sign and needs to be appreciated and encouraged.

If we can obtain some confidence in the people that they could experiment also on such methods where an artificial majority exists to be the only criterion of the collective decision-making process, we may move forward. It is the rigidity and fallacy of considering 51 per cent to be supreme and 49 per cent to be equivalent to zero which is at the root of all our present unrest. The spirit of accommodating the interests of all the concerned sections in the decision-making process finds no compulsion in the rules by which our political life is being regulated. This leads to an expression of distrust, desperation and ultimately of violence on the part of the vanquished group. It is necessary, therefore, that whenever conflicting interests are involved, instead of resorting to a mathematical counting of votes, a method of arriving at a consensus based on a commonly acceptable decision should be initiated. With the mounting magnitude of our problems and the increasing complexity of life, the consensus experiment will have to be progressively evolved if we do not want to be bogged down amidst the hurdles that will be created by those on whose coast the majority will tread. Therefore whenever a collective decision has to be taken, whether it is for choosing a representative or for arriving at an executive policy resolution, the method of determining the majority should gradually be so widened as to include the maximum number of interests represented. The sooner and faster we move in this direction the quicker will we be able to find a peaceful solution for the partitionism that prevails.

In this regard, there ought to be the following experiments started immediately, once the need as enunciated above is recognised.

(1) A method of elections in which all sections of the electorate would feel that the candidate will be chosen through collective choice



and not through a combination of groups out-manoeuvring the rest. The experiments in Yugoslavia of 'veteran' councils and the like must be explored and, after adjusting them to the situation in our country, given a trial.

(2) Even if the first step takes time, the decision-making bodies should try to evolve a formula by which their decisions will become more broad-based instead of being based on a simple majority. A differential scale could be evolved whereby the degree of importance of a decision would determine the percentage by which it is to be taken. In cases which touch the life of all people, the method of consensus should be evolved in such a way that a decision becomes the decision of the whole group, not only of those who are in its favour but also of those who choose to oppose it. This method could be tried out in smaller elected bodies like the village council, the municipality, the corporation and various voluntary agencies, and ultimately brought up to the level of the State Assemblies and the National Parliament.

(3) Even if the first two steps take time to find expression, there is need for common programs of action through which political parties and groups could jointly work out common projects of public weal—be it in the field of economic development, political action or cultural expression. The more numerous such areas of common action, the easier it will be to break barriers and open up avenues of mutual understanding, which will then form the base for any experimentation on structural political change.

#### ECONOMIC PACE

Secondly, let us consider the most tragic of the situations in our economic field. Even after 25 years of self-rule, we have not been able to raise the 40 per cent of our population who live below the subsistence level. The rise in GNP has not improved the conditions of the down-trodden so much as it has helped the upper class. Gandhi's stress on strengthening the weakest link has eluded our efforts so far, and that is why the country has resoundingly supported the need for a 'Gandhi Hina' movement.

To move in this direction, it is necessary that the productivity of the poorer classes should be immediately attended to and that is the priority of things they should have the foremost claim to whatever resources the country has of talents, money, material or men. The usual compulsions of the market rule of demand and supply should not be allowed to have their way in the matter of our priorities, if poverty is to be eradicated. Due to historical reasons, the elite and the ruling class, along with what is called the middle class, has been keeping a distance from the 70 to 80 per cent of our people who earn by the sweat of their labour. A complete change is, therefore, necessary in the attitude of the elite, and

methods should be immediately found out by which the lowest strata of our society could be helped. The sorrowful situation is that out of the 100 million families which constitute the Indian population, some two to three million have to go to bed without dinner. Some time or the other of the year ten million families experience the pangs of hunger. Hence it is imperative that before we attempt to do anything else we must assure ourselves that none in the land is obliged to sleep without meals. To have a national insurance against hunger, every locality, from a small village to a great city, must assure that its inhabitants are secure in their need for food. For this purpose it is necessary to start small industries or places of work where anybody who has no employment could come and work, and receive for his family at least two kilos of grain for eight hours of labour. This has become possible through the opening of small units of *Ambar Charkha*, which can be easily plyed by even a child or an old man. Spinning on this *charkha* gives an income of 15 paise per hank. Other methods also could be found out by which those who could not be provided with work, in spite of their eagerness to work, are given some subsistence wage to keep body and soul together. All this calls for planning from the bottom upwards. Therefore, 1973 should be a year of awakening—to our duty towards the poor of the land how to bring about relief to hungry bellies.

#### INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Now the third point is in regard to our international relations. Unlike any other country in the world, India stands out as a beacon for those who want to remain outside the arena of the conflicting super powers which are trying to carve the world into areas of influence. She should continue to refuse to be tied to the apron strings of any of the big bullies and prove by her example that pressures of security and helplessness will not make this country subservient to another—politically, economically or culturally. Twenty-five years of maturing through various vicissitudes have steeled the will and broadened the vision of India. The year 1973 should, therefore, see that the self-reliance for which our country stands is expressed unmistakably through our political and economic policies. Dependence in any one of the three fields—political, economic or cultural—will lead to dependence in the other two fields also.

To be able to find an expression to our *svadharma*, India will have to rely economically on its own resources. Other countries may be asked to help in a peripheral way but the burden of the reliance will be on our own. If the assistance ever assumes a magnitude whereby our self-reliance is decreased, we would be placing the reins of our conscience, to that extent, in the hands of the one on whom we rely. A strategy will have to be worked out by which cultural reliance on the spiritual growth

and historical dynamics of our country is integrated with our present economy. For this to be economically feasible, instead of relying too much on external aid, or even on trade to increase our foreign exchange earnings, all of which leads to a vicious cycle in which we being the weaker are always on the losing side of the game, our effort should be to rely more and more on our own resources. The very process of earning foreign exchange, through the export of traditional articles of agriculture or manufactured goods, merely helps the affluent sector of our society to get richer, and to get closer to the privileged population of the world, thus alienating it from the maligned millions of our land. Even if we do not want to align with or copy any particular political system evolved elsewhere, our economic and cultural dependence will miserably prompt us to toe the political line of the country on which we depend.

India must try to look at all the international problems in their right perspective, without being influenced by the big powers, and even at the risk of being a minority, she must proclaim what is good for the community of nations. The envoys of India abroad will act differently when they cease to be bargainers for national interests and become ambassadors of goodwill and peace, working for the downtrodden and the weak. Then they will help the world to feel at one. The heritage of the Buddha and Gandhi, which India represents, will be meaningless if this country, with one-sixth of the world's population, is not able to gradually diffuse its peaceful influence over the five continents and help in bringing together the forces of humanity which express themselves in the concept of the Family of Man. Our past history, our present hesitant steps and our future destiny demand that we move forward and become a force for peace in the world.

### *Harekrishna Mohan*

To have an idea of the problems which are likely to face the country in 1973, it is necessary to look back a little and see how things have developed since 1971. The year 1971 will be known in history as the year in which a major division took place in the Congress and a new Congress was born out of the old one. Hopes ran high and the entire population moved with an emotion which could be compared with that of 1931, when Gandhi initiated the non-cooperation movement. As that movement showed a way out of the then existing inertia, the movement which the new Congress has started under the leadership of Mrs Indira Gandhi appeared to point out a way to break the inertia which had engulfed the country. Both Indian and foreign observers clearly noticed the stagnation in the Indian society as if everything had come to a standstill. The new Congress corrected the situation and people started moving with high hopes. The unprecedented victory on the battle-front

and also on the political front confirmed the hope that a new situation was in the offing. The situation, as it was generally visualized, was that the masses would receive due consideration in the formulation of all governmental policies. The slogan was almost the same as it had been during the gandhian period. Gandhi used to emphasize the point that all governmental policies must keep in view the poorest and the least-advanced sections of the country. The same slogan was raised in 1971 but the terms used were different. The slogan of 1971 was democratic socialism. As it was difficult for the common people to know the distinction between *swaraj* and complete independence, to resolve it Gandhi translated the latter term as '*purna swaraj*'. It was similarly difficult for the common people to know the distinction between socialism as it is understood in the wide world and the raising of the common mass to the status of honour and prosperity as was conceived by Gandhi. The fact, however, is that the masses understood socialism in the manner conceived by Gandhi. Therefore they expected that their problems would be the main concern of the Government in the formulation of its policies. Victory in Bangla Desh wiped out the complex which grew after the defeat in NEFA. Nationalization of banks, abolition of proxy paries, etc. confirmed the hope that at least the attention of the Government would definitely turn towards the masses rather than the classes. The year 1971 ended with this hope.

The year 1972 was the year in which all the hopes were put to test. In spite of the glory achieved in the military and political fields, failures occurred on the economic front. Shortage of food and other essential articles and an abnormal rise in prices hit hard the common people. On the other hand, there was no indication of control on the expenditure not only of the Government but also of the classes benefited by governmental plans. Clearly two classes emerged in 1972—one enormously benefited by the Five Year Plans and the other deriving little or no profit from these plans. While shortage of essential goods and rise in prices affected the second class they did not affect the first at all. In this connection, one's mind goes back to the gandhian period when the movement of non-cooperation started. In all countries, and under all types of governments, there naturally grows a beneficiary class which derives benefits directly or indirectly from all governmental plans and activities. Discontent in the other class gradually grows and, ultimately, that discontented class overwhelms Government and their beneficiaries. Gandhi gave the lead to that non-beneficiary class in those days. The difference between the situation existing then and now is that the size of the beneficiary class then was much smaller than what it is now. Today, beginning from the villages to the cities, the beneficiary class has grown to such a size as could hardly be conceived in the pre-independence days. Even so the size of the non-beneficiary class continues to be

much larger than the beneficiary one. The discontent in this class has been growing since 1972. On one side, there is no indication of voluntary sacrifice of comforts while, on the other, there is enforced sacrifice and suffering. The principle of identification with the masses, which Gandhi advocated for the benefit of both the classes and the masses, has now been completely forgotten and given up. Therefore, there does not seem to be any possibility of a leadership growing in the class of the beneficiaries to regulate and harness the discontent in the non-beneficiary class. This is the reason that disorganised violence is on the increase all over the country. The same situation was there before Gandhi came on the scene in 1920.

However, even now all the hopes of the people are not gone, but they are fast receding. Unless the problems of the masses become the main concern of all governmental plans, discontent will grow; but, in the absence of proper leadership, there will be disorganised violence on the one hand and forced pathetic contentment on the other. These are the problems which the year 1975 is likely to face. The problems can be summarised as follows: (1) The common people do not think that they are the main concern of all the plans which are made for the country. (2) The classes which are benefited by the governmental plans do not exhibit any preparedness to come down and share the difficulties of the common people. (3) The leadership required for calling upon the classes to sacrifice for the masses does not appear to be existing today.

The picture, therefore, appears to be gloomy, but the solution seems to lie in to begin somewhere with some people, whatever their number may be. First, there must be some people to represent the masses properly even at the risk of incurring the displeasure of the authorities who are in a position to distribute favours and patronage. Providing leadership to the non-beneficiary class is a job which should attract youth even though in small numbers. The leadership must be well acquainted with the gandhian technique which alone can succeed in achieving the desired results.

*K.R. Maikani*

Our biggest single problem in India is that we just don't know what we are and where we want to go. There is no clear sense of direction.

Every country has a measure of itself; and every country assumes a role that, it thinks, is appropriate to itself. Thus for example the U.S kept expanding from the original 13 colonies because it thought it was its 'manifest destiny' to reach the Pacific and beyond.

Although Russia was always way behind other powers, it decided centuries ago that it had to be a great power. Through the efforts of

from the Terrible, Peter the Great and Lenin it has at last attained that status.

China pretends not to be interested in great power status. But no other country is more status conscious. The mandarin-turned-communists still look upon their country as a kind of Middle Kingdom. Just think of the way President Nixon was ushered into Chairman Mao's presence. It is significant that Marshal Chen-Yi, when he was Foreign Minister, once said: 'We will go without pants, if necessary, but we will make the nuclear bomb.'

Other countries also have, from time to time, aspired to, and attained, a status appropriate to their size, resources and opportunities. India is perhaps the only major country with a large size and a huge population which has not yet decided where it wants to go and what it wants to become. It only talks of peace among nations and goodwill among men without realising that a sermon is not a policy.

Actually, a big country like ours has to become strong and great if it does not want to break up. An impotent leonathan is not a very viable creature. It has to develop power to match its size or it will disintegrate. I think we should overcome our shyness and make it clear that our size, our resources and our civilisation entitle us to great power status. As Dr Panikkar used to say, we should declare the area from Aden to Singapore as our sphere of influence and see that nothing adverse to our interests takes place there. We must also smash the atom—and smash our way to a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. A course like that will give this country a goal to live for and die for. It will make India a major and independent power centre in the world. It will bring about a qualitative change over everything in the country.

However, nations do not become great for the asking. A nation has to be convinced of its greatness before it can become great. And here the issue of identity comes in. That is the second basic issue of our times.

Centuries of morale and foreign rule have distorted our personality. We ourselves are in *doubt* about our own identity. The result is a dichotomy running all through our lives. We spend astronomical sums on a nuclear program to become modern, and then stop short of producing the nuclear bomb—maybe on grounds of its excessive violence. We declare Hindi the 'national language', and then forget all about it—in the name of English as a 'subsidiary language'. We subsidise the *charkha* and wear *kurtyas*. Many of the men who praise basic education send their children all the way to missionary schools. We don't even seem to be sure whether our country is India, Bharat or Hindustan.

The Indian state today is Indian only in name; it is Anglo-Indian in its thinking and living. This alienates it from the masses and makes

is a parasitic class. It also makes it suspect in the eyes of proud nations like the Japanese and the French, who have come to look upon us as imitation Englishmen.

For all these reasons the establishment of our identity in all spheres of life has become a must. I wish Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* were made compulsory study in colleges. If this country is to discover itself and grow to greatness, it will have to decide, sooner rather than later, to put English on par with other major foreign languages for purposes of study—and make do with Indian languages, in whatever permutation or combination. That will immediately unshackle the Indian mind and remove the biggest single hurdle in the way of Indian resurgence.

This pride in *swadeshi* will have to be carried into all spheres of activity. Everybody complains about allopathy but almost everybody hangs on to it. By contrast, the Chinese have reserved acupuncture which, whatever its therapeutic value, has a Chinese identity, and a Chinese pride, built into it. Everybody complains of the law's delays and the high cost of justice—and yet there are no plans to revise the law in the light of Indian experience. Ancient Indian architecture has produced some of the wonders of the world—and yet there is no effort to apply these principles to modern building materials.

Only a firm belief in the value of the Indian way of life, and in the validity of the Indian view of life, can give people the mental and moral courage to stand up and build this country. Demotivated elements might dismiss this as chauvinism, but the fact is that only fierce patriotism can generate enough motive power to transform this country into something worth while. An upsurge like this will act as a solvent for all our other problems—whether of caste, class or region, of illiteracy, ill health or poverty.

And that brings me to the third major issue—less basic but more concrete—of our times, namely, economic growth. National identity and national power cannot grow in a climate of zero economic growth. Indeed national lassitude itself is a major factor in economic stagnation.

I need not go here into all that is wrong with the Indian economy. Suffice it to say that the economy should be oriented to production and not to politics. Anything that maximises production must be encouraged regardless of whether it adds to, or detracts from, the politician's power of patronage.

By the same criterion, the war of nations must end and the entire economy should be treated as a national sector. The Government has demoralised the decent entrepreneur by defaming all businessmen and at the same time allowed corrupt black-millionaires to crop up. The Planning Commission itself is manned by theoreticians and politicians, with not a single person having any experience of any branch of the economy. While the Government blames the God of rain for crop

failures, it has no explanation for industrial stagnation and financial mismanagement, high prices and high taxes.

I am afraid the Government of a developing country cannot be a party or group affair. It has to be a national enterprise in which all citizens see themselves as willing participants. Gandhi fully understood this mission when he saw to it that distinguished non-Congressmen like Dr Shyama Prasad Mukherjee and Dr Ambedkar were inducted into the first national Government. The aster one by one of these distinguished non-Congressmen quickly reduced the Government of India to an appendix of the Congress organisation, which in turn became an appendix of the man in power. Other parties find themselves excluded from all avenues of power and responsibility. They can hardly be blamed for gloating over the failures of a Government which never gives them credit for anything.

While parties—and elections on party basis—will, and must, go on, there should be a clear understanding among all parties that building India is not a party enterprise but a national enterprise, a yajna, in which all significant sections of society must have their due share. This is not a plea for a coalition Government. But this certainly is a plea for a Government of national consensus, manned by national talents, whose performance will be a matter of pride for the whole nation and whose problems would be regarded as national problems to be nationally handled. If a Republican U.S. President can include Democrats in his team, why can't a Congress Prime Minister include non-Congressmen in her Cabinet?

### *D.R. Maskekar*

If Gandhi were alive today and were to survey the Indian scene, these things will pain him most. For twenty-five years ago, when he departed from us, he had set this country along a course that would have led us, not perhaps to 'outrageous fortune', but to genuine progress and a truly better life.

If today the promised progress and better life are eluding our grasp and we are worse off than ever before, Gandhi would certainly attribute it to three major evils the country is afflicted with: (a) high corruption that has vitiated the very roots of the country's political and economic life; (b) an alarming erosion of the rule of law, which is the very plinth and foundation of a democratic and civilised life; and (c) a shocking lack of integrity in our public life, peaked as it is with politicians who are worshippers of the birth-goddess called 'Vote Bank' and who feel no qualms in sacrificing the country's interests at the altar of self-promotion and party strategy.

Also, in the last twenty-five years, whatever social discipline the Great



Leader bequeathed to his people had disappeared. And the most precious gift—the rule of law—of the departing British rulers, has been squandered and disrupted by their successors. So much so, the country is reverting to the jungle—the jungle that was India in the late eighteenth century when the British stepped in.

In pursuit of the cult of the bitch-goddess Vata Mata, the politicians have bred a people that know no responsibilities but only rights, and who at the slightest provocation take their grievances to the streets; where labour leaders vie with one another in egging on workers to demand higher and higher wages for less and less work, while shying to tell them the brutal truth that only hard work and higher productivity could bring the workers real better wages and the country economic progress. Indeed, this competitive trade unionism has put a premium on dishonesty and malfeasant among workers.

Gandhi set great store by truth, right conduct, honesty and simple living which guaranteed to the people an orderly, settled life, where the meekest and the weakest would automatically find justice, and where leaders would be fashioned in his own image and be humane and human, bending down to wipe the tears and bind the wounds of the sick and the suffering.

The Mahatma was not very much concerned with the statistics of economic growth and GNP, for he knew that all these things would follow automatically if a nation adhered to the basic values—the values that ultimately sustain a nation and give it the intrinsic internal strength, which goes by the term 'strength of character', so essential even for material progress and which, in the context of a nation, means a clean public life, with leaders inspired by a sense of duty and sacrifice, a responsible citizenry, and an industrious people imbued with social discipline. To a nation armed with these virtues no Five Year Plan target is impossible of attainment.

But if after twenty-five years of independence, the Indian nation lacks these very essential preconditions for growth and progress and is stagnating, economically and socially, who is responsible for it? The blame has to be squarely laid at the door of the leadership that has been in exclusive charge of the country's affairs all these twenty-five years.

Only the leadership can foster and nurture those vital virtues among the people. For people are so much clay that in the hands of an effective leadership could be moulded into a great nation, but in the hands of an indifferent leadership would go to seed. Gandhi had the qualities that could mould a nation to greatness.

Three decades ago Chiang Kai-Shek's China was dubbed 'a nation of coolies', lazy, degenerate and corrupt. But overnight, the new leadership under Mao Tse-tung transmuted the Chinese people into an industrious, disciplined, proud nation, where nobody accepted a up nor spat

in the street, and everybody worked hard and was socially responsible. In twenty-three years, China is not only a changed, but a different nation—thanks entirely to an honest, public-spirited and efficient leadership.

In 1949, when the Mao regime took over, India was ahead of China in many ways, particularly in terms of industrialisation and communication. Populationwise and in mass poverty, China was even worse off. But today Mao's China has forged far ahead of India. Why?

Which reminds me of Stalin's quip to Churchill during the last World War. When Churchill boasted of the virtues of democracy and individual liberty, Stalin curled his lip in disdain and retorted: 'What liberty? The liberty to sit on a Hyde Park bench and starve?'

Such was also the retort of the Communist Chinese when the Americans shed tears for them on their 'loss of liberty', following the installation of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Their only freedom till then consisted of the right to starve and get forcibly conscripted to fight and die in the wars of the notorious warlords of China.

Such might as well be the searing reply of the common man in India—to whom the concept of individual liberty is purely chimerical, and grinding poverty is the only reality.

"Enough is enough" is the present mood of the people, finding vent in widespread violence in the country in the shape of student riots and regional strife, unable to identify the faceless, impersonal travesties of present-day government.

Goaded by the 'revolution of rising expectations' and maddened by the subsequent 'revolution of rising frustrations' generated by a corrupt, inefficient and selfish leadership, the people may soon opt for 'guliti kalao *here and now*' as against the 'jam tomorrow' promised by democracy. In other words, they may choose the very tempting short-cut to progress—the short-cut of dictatorship, communism or fascism.

The glaring and ever-widening disparity between the rich and the poor, and the ever-worsening living conditions and day-to-day harassment from a corrupt officialdom, may drive people to desperate remedies. What is going on in the Philippines is the warning on the wall to those in our country who think they could get away with it all and continue to draw the wool over the eyes of the people.

Thus the supreme task before the country in the new year is tackling in good earnest the three evils named at the outset of this article, from which spring all the troubles the country is today suffering from. That task brooks no delay.

*Shrinani Narayan*

In my view, two crucial questions which must be answered categorically in India during 1973 are (1) what is the nature of Indian socialism,

which is sought to be established by the Government of India<sup>2</sup> and (2) which educational reforms are absolutely essential for liquidating unemployment and underemployment among the youth?

I have no manner of doubt that socialism in India must be a 'golden mean' between free enterprise and totalitarian regimentation. In other words, it cannot be either laissez faire or communism. India is the first country in the world which has launched an ambitious program of economic planning under a democratic structure. In consequence, the experience gained in the western democracies or the communist countries will not be of much avail to us. India's socialism cannot, then, be a carbon copy of the 'socialist pattern' followed in other countries. She must evolve her own type of socialism in conformity with the basic principles of her democratic Constitution. The Five Year Plans have been trying to formulate various programs in accordance with the Directive Principles of the Indian Constitution over the last two decades. Indian socialism should continue to follow, by and large, the same pattern in the coming decades with firmness and determination.

The present climate of uncertainty has been doing incalculable harm to India's economic growth and development. It is, therefore, imperative for the Government of India to announce its economic policy in the clearest terms without delay and then stick to it at least for the next ten or fifteen years. In the absence of such a clear-cut policy, further flow of investment, both in agriculture as well as industry, is bound to dry up and hamper national growth. It is true that our economic plans must be progressive in nature, and should extend direct assistance with a sense of emergency to the weakest sections of the population. But equality and justice need not be achieved at the cost of liberty and fraternity. The Preamble to our Constitution guarantees all these four fundamental values and we must accord equal sanctity and importance to all of them.

According to me, the objectives of Indian socialism should be: (1) full employment, (2) maximum production, (3) equitable distribution, and (4) self-reliance. For ensuring full employment, India must evolve her own technology of an intermediate nature which will have to be more labour-intensive than the western-type of technology which is labour-saving. In India, capital is scarce and labour abundant; in the highly developed countries like America, labour is scarce and capital abundant. Trying to imitate and import western technology into India is, therefore, bound to be a frustrating experience, leading to unemployment and waste of manpower. That is why Gandhi passionately pleaded for 'production by the masses' in place of 'mass production'. This could be attained only through a network of decentralized agro industries in the Indian countryside. It does not mean that there is no place for heavy or big industries in Indian socialism. The essential point is that most of the consumer

goods industries should be in the decentralised sector and provide gainful employment to the masses alongside agriculture, animal husbandry and dairying.

Full employment without maximum production would also be an exercise in futility. These two objectives must be attained simultaneously through improved technology which absorbs labour instead of ousting it. Unless India is able to augment her production in agriculture as well as industry at a fast rate, it would be impossible to ensure minimum standards of living to the millions who are today groaning under poverty and unemployment. As indicated earlier, a clear articulation of economic policy by the Government of India is a must for instilling confidence among the agriculturists as also the entrepreneurs.

For achieving equitable distribution, the order of priorities in the Five Year Plans will have to undergo a radical change. We must try to produce and supply food, cloth and housing to the masses at reasonable rates and in sufficient quantities. As a consequence, the production of fashionable consumer articles and luxuries for the richer classes must be curbed with a firm hand. First things must come first, the rest can follow in due course in accordance with the availability of national resources. The traditional theory of 'percolation' is now dead as a dodo; it has failed to help the poorest people at the lowest rung of the ladder. It is high time that our Plans extended direct assistance to the vulnerable segments of the population in a systematic manner.

Self-reliance is, obviously, indispensable for the rapid growth of developing countries like India. We can no longer depend on the aid of developed countries, especially the Super Powers, as such financial assistance is not likely to be available without political strings being attached to it. India, therefore, must learn to stand on her own feet and move forward on her own steam, as far as practicable. Here again, Gandhi's emphasis on self-help and self-dependence is of crucial relevance.

In regard to educational reform, the recent All India National Education Conference held at Sevagram, in the middle of October 1972, issued a 'Consensus' statement which deserves the serious attention of the Union and State Governments. Since the Conference was attended jointly by many Education Ministers, Vice-Chancellors and senior Sarvodaya workers, the statement, naturally, assumes special value and importance. I do hope that its suggestions and recommendations will be implemented without further loss of time. In brief, the educational system must be effectively linked with various programs of growth and development. Students must be trained for specific work under the Five Year Plans in accordance with manpower requirement. The examination system should undergo a radical change and there should be continuous internal assessment almost from day-to-day. Degrees should be delinked from employment and each Government department should hold its own examinations

for recruitment. There should be a large variety of diploma courses after the Matriculation examination, so that a majority of students are absorbed in specialised jobs without having to knock at the doors of colleges and universities for admission which, in effect, means only postponing the end day. It is also desirable to teach every student the basic principles of different creeds in order to enable them to imbibe religious tolerance and cultivate ethical and moral values in life.

The younger generation must also be very clear about the desirability of avoiding violence at all costs for achieving their objectives. In this connection, I cannot do better than quote from Arnold Toynbee's *Learning the Future* 'Try, I would say above all, to remain compassionate-minded and generous-minded, try to remain capable of entering into other people's states of mind and of sympathising with them even when you strongly disagree with them. Try to put yourselves in the other people's place and to see why they hold these opinions or do these things with which you so strongly disagree. Go on opposing the conservative-minded members of your parent's generation. Certainly try to resist them and to defeat them in as far as their ideas and ideals seem to you to be mistaken, but do this in the Gandhi spirit, do it without hatred.'

Toynbee adds: 'Above all, try to be patient and avoid violence. Take your lessons from the leaders of the great philosophies and religions. Try to copy the gentleness, the patience, the long-suffering of the Buddha and Jesus and of other great souls, such as Gandhi, who have appeared among us in our own time.'

### *Radhakrishna*

The problems India has faced during her 25 years of its independence—years also spanning the departure of Gandhi from the scene—can be isolated and identified. To me, however, whether they are economic problems (like increasing unemployment, a stagnating GNP), social problems (like non-involvement of people in working out their own welfare development), educational problems (like youth unrest, an inadequate educational system), ethical problems (like declining standards of moral conduct, the divergence between practice and precept), or cultural problems (like alienation of sections of society from one another, the generation gap), they all represent but diverse faces of a single problem, namely, our inability to choose the right model for socio-economic development at this turning point of our history.

Gandhi had fancied that freedom would usher in a new society, a counter-society, which would be closely related to his philosophy of life. He did not, of course, produce a blueprint of that society. But he perceived its contours as combining the progressive and dynamic forces

which the true Indian genius is capable of throwing up. A vast number of details in this concept has no doubt yet to be filled in. But inherent in it was the seed of a new society. Whether it was the Constructive Program, the transformation of the Congress into a Lok Sabha Sangh, or the weapon of satyagraha, it was all a means to bring about and sustain this new society.

As a matter of fact, our failure to take the right decision at a crucial point in our history has not only affected our own country but the entire Third World. 'The Third World is becoming a breeding ground for the theorists of "identity crisis" and "the revolution of rising expectations" and provides the basis for a growing militarisation of the world, large-scale economic exploitation and widening internal disparities as a price for getting a pat on the back as "models" of successful economic development. The political consciousness of this was a continuing sport in which coups and counter-coups were watched with gusto by a "concerned" world press'.<sup>1</sup>

We have fashioned our political and economic development strategy strictly on western models, neglecting the value system that could have helped us to make the critical choice. The choice that was made in 1946-47 can be seen in the context of what has happened in the Third World so that even yet we may wake up to a different perspective and a dynamic direction. The question, largely, is: Do we have the perception?

At the time of independence, it appears as though a concerted attempt was made to separate the advanced element of the Indian national movement from its more indigenous backbone. A careful study of the documents available on British policy in the period 1942-47 indicates that a crucial element in it was the highlighting of conflicts in the independence movement itself.<sup>2</sup> It should be obvious to anybody that the task the rulers set for themselves was to concede independence, realising its inevitability, to those who were nearest to their own ideas and outlook. Gandhi and those who thought like him had thus to be removed from positions of influence and authority through whatever means available. In this task the British seem to have had the full support of the Americans, whose aim, according to Roosevelt, was that they 'should try to think of some arrangement by which India found its place in the European and American, i.e. Western, orbit rather than the Asiatic'. The administrative, judicial and educational system which has continued in last 25 years is only a perpetuation of the very system which the rulers employed to subjugate India. In a remarkably frank

1. Rajni Kothari, 'Reflections on Building a New State in the 70s', paper presented at Seminar on Bangla Desh, January 1972.

2. *India, The Struggle of Power*, Vols. 1, 2 and 3 (HMCO Publications).

statement, Atlix is reported to have said, 'It is one of the great achievements of our rule in India that, even if they did not entirely carry them out, educated Indians do accept British principles of justice and liberty. We are condemned by Indians not by the Indian ethical conceptions but by our own, which we have taught them to accept.' Even the Constitution of India had to draw heavily upon and become a mix. of the British and American structures. The neglect of independent thinking at that point of history was too costly a matter to be ignored.

In spite of what Gandhi and other social reformers did in the beginning of this century, our own knowledge of ourselves has been very poor. In his introduction to the book, *Civil Disobedience and Indian Freedom*, Jayaprakash Narayan says 'After the first few years of euphoria since independence, a period set in of self-degradation in which educated Indians, particularly those educated in the West, took the lead. Whether in the name of modernisation, science or ideology they ran down most, if not all things Indian.' Not merely in the field of state-own, politics or administration, but even in the field of science and technology what is happening is merely a transplanting of what was developed during that period in the European world.<sup>1</sup> Such transplanting has taken place not only at the level of theories, but even more so as regards the organisation of technology and the direction of research. It is perhaps an exaggeration to add that science and technology in India, as far as it concerns our ordinary life, is only a little less barren than our state system and politics.

This is the crux of the nation's dilemma, and from this point of view the gandhian challenge is essentially an eye-opener. It questions both the assumptions we make in working out a blueprint of society and the means and method we use for its achievement. If we are not to go through the same vicious circle, ignoring the experience of others, our choices are limited. We are not completely lost; it is still open to us to see if the direction, policy, priorities and programs of this country—whether in economic development, education, social structures or political policy—could be entirely in a way different from what we have followed so far. Events not only in India but all over our neighbouring countries call for a social cybernetic model of development different from the prevalent linear model. The choice is between an economy which would sow the seeds of war and internal disunity, leading to centralisation of political and economic power, on the one hand, and the gandhian plan of antipodays on the other. The cracks, stresses and strains that are appearing in our body politic and social should be

1. Dharampal, *Indian Science and Technology in the Eighteenth Century* (New Delhi, 1972).

sufficient to indicate to us the dangers lying ahead. Gandhi's ideas, approaches and methods appear at this stage much more relevant to the problems we are facing. The critical years ahead command us to make a wise and careful choice. Do we have the wisdom to make it? That is the crucial question.

### M. Rukhaswamy

Earlier this century a woman novelist with the pseudonym John Oliver Hobbes wrote a novel, which had some vagueness, called *The Dream and the Barrenness*—a story of a period's hopes and ambitions and the failure to realise them in actual life. It is of Gandhi's great dream for India and of the failure of Governments and the people of free and independent India to realise it that I wish to speak. One of the great political visions that Gandhi in his writings and speeches rendered to India, and which I pinpointed nearly 50 years ago in my first essay in political criticism entitled 'The Political Philosophy of Mr Gandhi', was to bring into prominence the place of the village in the social, economic and political structure of India and the clamant need for improving the conditions of the villagers and the people that lived in them, the vast majority of the people of India. He was the apostle of rural reconstruction. In more than four decades of *Harjan* and *Young India* he preached this gospel of rural reconstruction.

Writing in *Harjan* of 29 August 1936 he says that 'if the village perishes India will also perish'. And he looked to the revival of the village, its prosperity and its self-government for the political regeneration of India. He pointed out ways of improving the conditions of the people of the villages through rehabilitation of agriculture and breeding of cattle and the improvement of village industries to promote the economic prosperity of the country. As for village industries, writing in *Constructive Program*, he said that 'village recovery cannot be complete without the continuance of the old village industries like hand-spinning of gown, paper-making, soap-making and such old crafts'. He had no objection to the modernisation of village industries. Writing in *Harjan* of 29 March 1936 he said that 'provided the character of village industries is maintained, there will be no objection to the villagers using even modern machines and tools that they can make and afford to use'. His ideal village entity, according to an article in the *Harjan* of 26 July 1942 was 'a complete republic independent of its neighbours for its own vital wants and interdependent for many articles'. Not only improvements in agriculture and cattle breeding and improved village industries, but he would also provide amenities like village wells for supply of clean drinking water, village schools, village playgrounds, village libraries. And, of course, he would remove the old patriarchal system of self-



government. In fact, it was through the village and through the villagers, those who lived there, that he would plan the resurrection of India.

What has happened to this dream of Mahatma Gandhi? It is a sorry business the story of rural reconstruction in free and independent India. The villages of India—the vast majority of them—are still in the miserable, unhealthy, poverty-stricken condition which he deplored and for which he castigated the British rulers. His writings, if only they are read and reflected, would castigate the present rulers of the country, many of them his disciples and followers. Nearly 400,000 out of the 535,000 villages of India are without safe drinking water, the women of these villages still have, to go a mile or two to fetch drinking water, not always drinkable, in pots on their heads. The same number of villages are without proper village roads that would connect them with the nearest market and thus serve to lift agriculture from the subsistence economy to the market economy which will bring prosperity to the farmers. 300 millions of the village population are still living in mud hovels, under-employed for want of developed village industries, even the cottage industry of spinning and weaving which Gandhi advocated sinking in the slough of despair. All the Five Year Plans that have been made by the Governments in India have done precious little for the improvement of the villages and for village reconstruction. Most of the money allotted to the construction of roads has been spent on privileged projects like the All India Highway from Kachnar or Dargajing to Kurnool, most of the money allotted for water supply, sanitation and drainage is spent on cities and towns, by far the much larger amounts of money allotted for industry are spent on large-scale industries. The literacy of the villages is half that of towns and the literacy of women is half that of men and literacy grows only at the rate of one per cent per year. Cities have prospered in buildings (mostly official and commercial palaces), in amenities, in educational facilities, in civilization and culture; while the villages, the vast majority of them, have stayed where they were in Gandhi's time. Cities have grown at the expense of the villages. Cities have grown richer and the villages have stayed poor. Cities are growing into the Great Wen in the body politic of India.

Is it going to be a vain cry from the dead—this appeal of Gandhi on behalf of the villages and the village people of India? It should not be if we are to judge from the patronage given by Governments in India to the republication and propagation of his writings. The volume of his writings on villages and village reconstruction should be the bible of every minister, of every legislator, of every newspaper, of every public man. It looked as if in the centenary year of his birth the wind was changing, for Governments in India as represented by Ministers, from the Prime Minister onwards, seem to have rediscovered the villages of India and the people that inhabit them. They seem to have turned their

thoughts and plans to rural reconstruction. They seem to have come to realise that the vast majority of the villagers of India are without the safe drinking water, the roads, the decent housing, the modernisation of village industries that would spell the prosperity of India. But the plans and programs of Governments are judged and voted by the sums of money allotted to each of them. Until and unless each of these plans and programs for rural reconstruction are put into figures they cannot impress. Until we find that at least Rs 250 crore are allotted in any future five year plan to each of these programs of village roads, village drinking water wells, village housing, village industry, we cannot believe in the genuineness and promises of these plans and programs. For instance, in the Fourth Five Year Plan the outlay on small-scale and village industries was to be Rs 250 crore as against an outlay of Rs 1337 crore on large-scale industries. Unless this ratio is radically changed in favour of the small and village industries, all the talk about the plans for fostering and promoting the village industries must be taken as 'words and fury signifying nothing'. One can only hope that the writings of Gandhi on village reconstruction will hit the conscience of our rulers and translating his Dream into Business.

*Manubhai Shah*

1973 is in many ways a crucial year opening up a new era in which India will have to decide her future course of history. The coming decade will also determine whether what Gandhi taught us during his momentous life has any vital insights to guide us on our future course. In my view, Gandhi will dominate our minds and our minds' eyes in the coming years more than ever before, for he was the greatest educator that India produced in recent times.

We are indeed passing through a watershed of our history. Old values are fast fading away but no new values appear to be taking their place. The old system seems to be out of date, but is it being replaced by a new system?

Three very vital issues are facing us today. First, there is too much fear in the air. Secondly, moral values, honesty and integrity seem to be of no consequence. Thirdly, our democratic structure is getting unhinged. These three issues need to be reconsidered and necessary correctness applied are long.

Gandhi was not only khadi or prohibition or the spinning wheel; not only nonviolence or removal of untouchability or trusteeship; not only ayodya or the freedom of the bowels of the bow or *daridranayana*. He was all these and much more—something lasting and permanent in terms of a value-based and system-based revolutionary reconstruction of our fragmented society. He had his practical, human-

capacity-based values and systems, with which alone a successful revolution can be carried out and accomplished in a deeply poverty-stricken society as ours. Our revolution is to build a strong, democratic, exploitation-free society. For this mighty task Gandhi as well as other stalwarts of our past and present are relevant. In this year 1973 we do need to clearly accept certain basic values and systems on which to build up our socialist democratic society, and in this gandhian insights are a most valuable guide for us.

First and foremost, Gandhi practiced as well as preached 'freedom from fear'. It is the duty of our national leaders at all levels, and more so at the highest level, to permit, encourage, respect and respond to the value of dissent. Without the freedom to dissent, no revolution can be applied successfully in a free democratic, socialist or egalitarian society. Even where the forces of reaction or extreme radicalism seem to gather momentum, an effort to take the cooperation of dissidents is a 'must' in the gandhian armoury and the gandhian ethos.

The second most vital value that Gandhi taught us is that even if we are not all saints, in order to re-establish a strong, healthy and united national character, the values of honesty, integrity and simplicity (not austerity) have got to be practiced at all levels of leadership. Pragmatism or exigencies of situation are being given undue importance. After all, whatever needs to be done within the processes of democratic functioning can be done with basic integrity and simplicity. Even though it is not at all possible for any or all of us to practice what Gandhi practiced and preached, it is imperative that in a country of our great historical and cultural past we must re-emphasize and implement the values of integrity and simplicity. These are not idle or ideal conditions meant only for saints (or hypocrites) or gods. I know many will try to mislead this. But I am certain that if these values are scoffed at, the nation and our leadership will have to pay a heavy price, heavier than what an eternal or gandhian value-based society would demand of us—namely, to adhere to and to practice the basic tenets of integrity and honesty and to live and work with simplicity and with a sense of equality and fearless comradeship.

Gandhi will be incomplete with only a value-based society if it is not married to a democratic and decentralized system. A value-based and system-based society alone can bring socialism and egalitarianism to a democratic nation. Even oral and autocratic people have been known to practice simplicity and integrity. There have been kings, dictators and emperors who led simple, honest and austere lives. But they left after them only a foundation-less, weak and crumbling society as soon as they disappeared from the scene. Therefore Gandhi insisted that the leadership at the top should promote, encourage and constantly help to nurture and build a multi-tiered functional leadership in order to delegate,

decentralise and develop power and authority at all levels.

If over-centralised power and authority were to replace decentralisation, a weak and divided nation will be the result. Gandhi never stood for or advocated a weak central national leadership. The withering away of the state of Gandhi's conception referred not to a state without leaders but to a state with leaders at all levels, self-reliant, respectful of lower levels and loyal to the higher skeleton of leadership. It is true that a strong and healthy country requires that vital residual powers and authority must remain vested at the highest level. In his time, Gandhi was the final head in all crises; and yet how often, almost to the point of self-humiliation, he yielded to the wishes of his followers. How many men and women he created as leaders at different levels of this vast humanity of ours. And in spite of frequent wranglings and disputes—which were no less in the years he lived with us than now—everyone often felt a sense of participation, involvement and belonging.

We have to practise, even if in an humble way, what Gandhi preached and practised all his life, by letting others at lower levels and still more lower levels act on their own initiative and motivation. That is why Gandhi advocated *panchayat raj*, *gram swaraj*, self-sufficient units and village democracy. This did not mean that he wanted a weak centre or a loosely fragmented country. A united country and strong central and state governments are not inconsistent with a decentralised, delegated, socialist democracy.

In the last twenty-five years, we have taken many steps in decentralisation. At the same time we have had to centralise and sometimes to over-centralise. Consequently the process of system-based democratic functioning has severely suffered. In all societies, situations arise and events take place which make all and particularly the leadership at top levels to feel that lower levels are most incompetent to take proper and correct decisions, and hence tendencies have developed at different periods in this quarter century of our freedom when the lower levels have been relaxed or deprived of their proper functions. It may be all right for a while, but in the long run Gandhi will prove right, as when he said that adult and universal franchise is better than a selective franchise. He himself toyed with the idea of a 'quality' and 'selective' franchise, but every time in the end he found, admitted and insisted on decentralisation as the manner arbiter of a stable and strong nation.

It is true that at lower levels, sometimes the decisions taken are wrong or factional or tend to weaken or make us loose in terms of progress. And yet, even though the process looks long and time-consuming, it is better to let lower levels use their initiative for the tasks entrusted to their care. They will make mistakes but they will learn their mistakes and rectify them. That is an inescapable process for their education and maturing.

'It is not a few excellent men who can govern well; it is the mediocre, the multitude, if trusted and allowed to function, that can give a strong, equality-based, socialist, democratic nation', Gandhi used to say often. He saw in the trust and faith in the common man the true foundations of an active and healthy democracy.

Therefore, in this year 1973, I would urge on all thinkers, leaders and persons in authority to analyse the steps that they take and the decisions they make and see whether: (1) we are building up men and women as leaders at different levels, (2) whether we allow and trust others, duly constituted, to function and to act in their respective spheres, (3) whether persons at different levels act on the basis of integrity and discipline, and (4) whether the end-products that we get create a social and political structure which will survive the long chain of history, where leaders come and go, but new leaders must be continually thrown up so that the future is held in the trust of men and women, one generation after another, who can keep the flag flying in glory.

This requires deep and frank heart searching. It will require cool introspection. Winning an argument or debating point will not help. We have to examine whether what we learnt and saw in the period of struggle under Gandhi has any meaning or validity in the present or not. There are good trends and bad trends in our situation. Gandhi reminds us that if, because of exigencies of situation, we miss the opportunity to insist on and practice values and to lay down a system, we will be missing his guidance to us. His path is not difficult to follow, for he never advocated an idealistic society or an idealistic approach. And 1973 beckons us to introspect and accept these basic fundamentals of Gandhi, his life, thought and work.

### S. Shukla

To thoughtful and socially aware Indians, notwithstanding all that had happened in 1971, 1972 even when it arrived was not the year of exuberant confidence that daily and weekly journalism had proclaimed. Is 1973 the year of uncertainty, discomfort and restlessness bordering on desperation, even as glittering exhibitions in the Capital and 'socialist' pronouncements seek to reassure us? The aftermath of expensive military action, coinciding with the odd adverse year in the monsoon cycle, provides the backdrop against which to reflect on deeper and more pervasive trends on a national as well as global scale.

Our specific national troubles arise, of course, from the historical circumstances of having been a colony in the crucial period of the industrial and scientific revolutions. The consequences are many and profound. We converse in a tongue foreign to the overwhelming majority of our people. We thus disaffanchise them from the realm of

ideas, constructive as well as revolutionary, even as we train and disable ourselves in respect of the capacity to conceptualise the reality of our people and our existence in ways capable of transforming them both. A late arrival on the political and industrial map of the world, we not only suffer all the consequences of an adventive belatedness of trade—material, intellectual and those relating to power—but do so in an era when the resources of the globe are fast getting depleted, while the capacity of man to fashion social organisation and values commensurate with his increased 'command' over nature flounders, increasingly, a question mark. With a seventh of the world's population and with one-fifthth its land, our problems of both day-to-day survival and any move into a more meaningful technology and social organisation are of the utmost, rendered no less acute by the fact that we have an elite and an intelligentsia which is exposed to and has ambitions for the most 'advanced' standards of living in the world even to the point of ambivalence in its commitment to its nation and people.

None of this is, to be sure, the product of last year or the specific challenge of the coming one. But it is failing to recognise that only a quarter of a century ago, our choices were much more wide open. China's emergence after 1949 into rampant modernisation and nationhood and its consequent growth to world-power status—whatever we think of any aspect of its development—has constricted our choices further even as our problems have got aggravated. The direction of development envisaged by our elite is unmistakable. For itself, it is not prepared to settle for anything less than the 'best' in technology and life styles available elsewhere around the globe. The inequalities that that produces would not worry it, if it were not for the fact that the rest of the people also ask for a piece of the pie and are, in any case, not willing not to ask for the 'best' for themselves if they see it right within their own commitment. Hence the need for 'garibi hatao'. The cost of the 'haves' is much larger than it might otherwise be precisely because of the affluent ways of the elite. Meagre are the resources that remain for development, whether on the classical, hard, heavy industrialisation model, so attractive for its promise of national self-reliance and economic independence or even international economic and military-political muscle, or on the lines of the Mahabub-Huk-McNamara new economies so attractive to Gandhians or non-Gandhians (a la Iwanlich calling for deschooling as well as schooling society). The main hopes of the managers of the system, however illusory or frail, lie in directions international. Perhaps the multinational corporations will see India as the ideal investment arena, with its huge and relatively cheap and ample supply of transportation, trained and inexpensive manpower and a moderately stable and sophisticated commercial-industrial environment. Possibly these, along with indigenous enterprise, will succeed

is 'transferring technology' and transferring back profits, to and from the more underdeveloped parts of the globe. All of this may create enough employment and prosperity in the country to expand as well as enrich the elite at the same time that the rest of the people are kept away from being unduly restless through immediate improvements in living, through hopes of a better future and through a certain medium of social mobility into the elite, so that the most talented and potentially politically difficult elements are continuously removed from their original places. Dissent will thus remain marginal and incoherent and become amenable to normal 'law and order', now made more 'efficient' by modern technology and communication. Ideology could be made more acceptable through consciousness media and some dissent could even be organised.

Past history may perhaps find little fault with this perspective. After all, most nations have been built on some such basis. There are only two difficulties. Is this perspective practicable? Does it not look much less appealing or moral today than it might have in an earlier century or epoch? Also, nowhere in history has an elite thought and concerned in language other than that of the people. Nowhere has its script been as undecipherable. Nowhere has it been as exclusive a club (two per cent of the population) for this reason. Effectively insulated from its native reservoir of ideas, practices and concepts through the difference of language, script and idiom, its escape from the world of work and people becomes more 'natural' and more easily possible. The English-(or even Sanskrit-) based pan-Indian unity of the intelligentsia is an effective barrier against its unity with its peoples. In this the Europeans have had a happier history. Having first united their nations speaking their common languages, they are now moving to an economic and political unity on the more substantial basis of popular participation and culture. For India such a prospect is open only separately—to the Nagas region extending from the north to the western coast, to the Bengali region and so on. To me, the language barrier, i.e. the English-non-English barrier, is at the present stage a crucial social-political barrier in our country. The displacement and detachment of English by the languages of the people remains a crucial step in the consolidation of the society in different regions. (This does not preclude the existence of more than one state in a language region.) All administrative, political, economic and educational measures that follow from the need to dissolve the English-non-English divide and to consolidate the position of the Indian languages are essential preliminaries to the building of a more viable and humane society. This appears more difficult in 1973 than it did in 1943. But only so if we ignore that the non-English-speaking are the deprived. The deprived are a native force in any society, given, of course, appropriate ideology and organisation. Are there any possibili-

tion in our country?

There do not appear any easy answers to the political-ideological questions asked. In any case, these answers are evolved by gifted and committed practitioners for serious and intellectual to write about, appraise, rationalise. Whatever be those answers, it seems clear that both in the process of achieving and consolidating desirable change, a new set of values and desires will have to be installed. A very pervasive process of political and social education for new values and new skills, without which man cannot live a humane life in an materially poor an environment as this country, is called for. An essential element of this education is capacity, skill and a positive attitude for the socially useful and productive work of the immediate, if 'primitive', environment—the exact opposite of what is produced both by today's organized formal education and by our political and social environment. Formal education cannot but follow the existing given structure of economic and political power. It can only socialize and prepare for the structures of incentives set up by the distribution of power and resources emerging from the capitalist-monopolist organization of industry and agriculture and, following it, of organized politics. But politics, which in the historical experience of India has been at the base of major changes like national independence, now requires to generate a new set of norms and values. For two decades, electoral politics helped to catalyze many changes, among them a much needed diversification of India's political structure. The past five years that have followed have demonstrated that this by itself is not enough. The tasks of restructuring economic power, of distributing decision making to all the people, of developing new values and skills through formal as well as widespread political and social education remain. And these tasks are now measurably more substantial, as noted earlier, than a quarter of a century ago.

One does not feel too cheerful raising questions in a pessimistic tone. Possibly the pessimism is explained by the fact that we are all a quarter of a century older than in 1947. But the fact remains that 1973 sees the facile optimism of 1947 or 1967 or even of late 1971 yield place to a mood of deep questioning, of a reserved quest. Does India have a place in the world? Can man live a human existence of dignity and of freedom from deprivation and oppression on this part of the globe? Can we do anything about man-made machines running horrors on brave people as in Vietnam? Can we limit the growing chasm between the upper tenth and the lower half of Indian society? To yield to a mood of despair would mean, indeed, a denial of even the possibility of a fully human existence. But to deny that there are no known answers or that the quest for answers looks difficult, in principle and in practice, would be possible only by denying even the nature and the magnitude of the problem.



*K. Subrahmanyam*

The year 1972 started for India in a mood of exuberant confidence and in the months slipped by a significant part of this confidence has evaporated. As we enter 1973 the country is bracing itself to face a period of food shortage. A considerable amount of heart searching is going on in the country in regard to our planning processes, methodology, priorities, etc.

The 25th anniversary of independence was celebrated in a sober mood. At the end of four development plans, it is now universally accepted that 40 per cent of our population live below the poverty line. The top 10 per cent get and consume nearly 30 per cent of the country's income. The amount of money the top five per cent earned from the tax authorities will more than cover the entire annual defence expenditure of the country. The foreign exchange lost because of smuggling indulged in for the benefit of the consumption-goods-hungry new rich is again more than what the country allocates for its security. The priorities of the national development plans have got distorted mostly for the benefit of this class. With tragic irony we may recall that the Mahalanobis Committee went into this problem as early as in 1951-52, at the end of the second plan, and in the last 10 years the problem has been further compounded. We are currently indulging in mock exercises, debating how far economic growth can be optimised with social justice, defence with economic development and democratic value system with social discipline.

There is a trend to coin new phrases and slogans, not because the old phrases and slogans have lost their significance but because we are really afraid to use those value-loaded terms in the current day context when the only value espoused by the parasitic elite is self-aggrandisement at the cost of the masses. The old slogan of *swadeshi* is as evocative as the new slogan of self-reliance, but the former carries with it the implication of the reduction of conspicuous consumption, boycott of foreign goods, rigorous resource mobilisation, etc. This cannot be adopted by an elite which does nothing about smuggling, of the order of Rs 200 crore a year, and trades mainly on black money, estimated at between Rs 1500 and Rs 2000 crore. Gandhi produced a atmosphere of social compulsion in which it became difficult for people to flaunt imported goods, and he deliberately made bonfire of foreign cloth and foreign goods against the protests of many respected leaders of traditional thought and values. Are we courageous enough to invoke the old slogan of *swadeshi* again in order to generate the same social compulsion on our elite?

Purna swamy also meant freedom from all kinds of pressures, including neo-colonialist ones. It carried the implication that the country's

security must be safeguarded and its continuous development ensured. It is a concept which will not tolerate a small fraction of the population compromising the country's development and security for its own class benefits.

Those who opposed Gandhi and Nehru, their *swadishi* ideology, their concept of *poorna swaraj* and their commitment to the Indian masses, have triumphed. The value system of the present elite is that of the maharajas, the zamindars, the British knight, the Ras Bahadurs and shikari contractors who got their children educated in Oxford and Cambridge and who dreamt of India continuing as the brightest jewel of the imperial crown. Japanese TV sets and American goods have replaced Lancashire cloth and British imported products in our elite's lives. The Harvard and Stanford business schools have replaced Oxford and Cambridge. The new neo-colonialist dependence has substituted the colonialist dependence.

Our planning process and our economic development philosophy have so far been geared merely to an effort to produce more goods and services without bothering to define the national value system which these processes must serve. The vague phraseology of 'socialist pattern' and 'mixed economy' enabled the state to enrich themselves, and the planners, the bureaucracy, the political parties—all part of the same elite—have avoided committing themselves to a national value system. Whether we adopt the western management philosophy or a socialist approach, it is necessary to start with the case. What kind of society are we aiming to create? Our objectives must be derived from that goal and our plans formulated towards the fulfilment of those objectives. Without commitment to a basic ideal, the planning process has become sub-optimum and reaching of targets in various sectors an end in itself. It has been used by the elite to serve its own purpose. Investments were made, industries were established, incomes were generated and even a certain economic growth was achieved. But the benefits did not get distributed for lack of the basic commitment.

The crucial questions for India, not only for 1972 but for years to come, are whether this neo-colonialist, parasitic value system can be changed to a *swadishi* value system, whether the present elite will perceive its own interest in such a change of values or whether it will have to be put through the kind of cultural revolution which Gandhi attempted from 1920 onwards, and whether this can be done within the framework of our constitutional processes or a certain measure of extra-constitutionalism will be necessary.

C. Subramaniam

It is appropriate that *Gandhi Marg* should have organised a Symposium

on the 25th anniversary of Gandhi's martyrdom. A new generation comes up every 25 years. It is natural for the young men and women of today, who are the products of the post-gandhian era, to wonder whether Gandhi is still relevant for the problems of contemporary India. The answer, it seems to me, is a clear affirmative. As time goes by, we find ourselves constantly returning, with renewed admiration and gratitude, to Gandhi's analysis of our basic problems and what he taught us about where the solutions to them lay. During his long and active life, he was interested in almost all the crucial issues—political, economic and social—which confronted the country. Nothing that affected the welfare of the people was too small or unimportant for his personal concern. In the same issue of *Young India* or *Manjan* one would find articles by him on a complex negotiation with the British Government and on the nutritive value of the mango seed or on the proper use of organic manure as fertilizer. This width of approach was a reflection of his total involvement in all aspects of the life of the people.

The problems of poverty, unemployment and education were, however, the three major issues that were the continuous concerns of Gandhi. To my mind, these remain the three major problems that confront the country. They are not only the overriding issues to which our development effort has to address itself; they are also intimately inter-related. Poverty cannot be abolished unless there is productive employment. There cannot be sustained employment unless education is broad-based and functional. The educational system in turn has to take note of the economic conditions in which rural India lives and labours and cannot progress unless living standards are improved. Thus genuine progress can be achieved in tackling each of these problems only if all of them are attacked together.

The most important insight that Gandhi gave us in our political struggle was that means should conform to ends. To him it was meaningless to fight for the value of a free, open, just and nonviolent society through means which negated these values. In the sphere of economic development, the problem of ends and means takes the form of a search for achieving growth in a form and manner which simultaneously secures social justice. Growth per se will not be meaningful unless national wealth and national income are so distributed that every single person in the country—man, woman or child—has his or her needs for maximum consumption adequately fulfilled. The composition of GNP, the distribution of incomes and the pattern of development are as crucial as the level of aggregate growth which is needed for economic betterment. Since the structure of the production mechanism is meant to satisfy present and prospective consumer demands, the pattern of production cannot be changed unless the distribution of

income) and the consumption pattern are also altered. There can be a conformity between ends and means in the process of economic growth only if income and employment opportunities are consciously created in the hands of the poorest sections of the people so that they have the purchasing power to secure for themselves adequate food, clothing and shelter. These increased income and employment opportunities must also lead to productive investment and to higher production so that the slice of the cake and the share in it for the poor keep growing in a self-sustaining manner.

This outline can be translated into certain specific objectives. At the earliest stage of life we should assure equality of opportunity to all by providing nutrition to pregnant mothers and to pre-school children so that right from birth all citizens are endowed with an adequate physical and mental development. At the next stage of life, education should be free and universal. The educational system should take into account economic conditions and should emphasize full enrolment of girls as well as boys. School nutrition can itself be a powerful instrument for averting wastage and stagnation. The school system should also be oriented around agricultural practices and local crafts and trades so that it becomes fully relevant to the social and economic life of the people. There should also be a massive program for increasing literacy among adults as this is an essential pre-condition for progress in many sectors such as better farming, industrialisation, family planning and so on. Education has to lead to employment. Employment opportunities will have to be provided on a massive scale in both rural and urban areas. India is well endowed with land and natural resources. There is much scope and potential for increasing the productivity of land and for harnessing our natural resources so that our vast human resources are also fully utilised in promoting rapid and self-sustaining growth. Apart from wage labour, the opportunities for self-employment can also be vastly increased through land reforms and a credit system which reaches the smallest farmer and artisan. As Gandhi pointed out, "No man should have more land than he need for dignified sustenance" and as he said, "Who can dispute the fact that the grinding poverty of the farmer is due to their having no land to call their own?"

Gandhi also pointed out that 'Civilisation is the real cause of the wide contrasts met in the multiplexedness but in the dabbarness and voluntary reduction of wants'. He went so far as to say that 'If I take anything that I do not need for my own immediate use and keep it, I theft it from somebody else'. In a country as large and backward as India, we have to promote this concept of austerity and abstinence at all levels if we are serious about providing minimum acceptable levels of consumption to the poorest. Sufficiency for all cannot be secured with surplus for some. Poverty cannot be abolished unless it is first

shared. This was Gandhi's concept of 'daridranatya' which, I would submit, is an insight of the greatest significance and relevance to us today.

## WHO'S WHO

Shahid Mohamed Abdullah, Former Prime Minister of Jamaica & Kashmir.

Mulk Raj Anand, Editor, *Maya*, Bombay

A. Appadurai, Visiting Professor, School of International Studies, New Delhi

V. Balakrishnan, Editor, *Eastern Economist*, New Delhi.

Babubhai M. Choksi, Member of Parliament.

Durga Das, author of *India—From Curzon to Nehru and After*

R. R. Dwyer, Chairman, Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Archbishop Angelo Fernandes, Archbishop of Delhi

Devendra Kumar Gupta, Secretary, Gandhi Smarak Nidhi,

Hansrajshree Mahesh, former Chief Minister of Orissa.

K. R. Malkani, Editor, *Motherland*, New Delhi.

D. R. Mookherjee, author of *The Guilty Men of 1857*, etc.

Shrihan Narayan, Governor of Gujarat.

Radhakrishna, Secretary, Gandhi Peace Foundation.

M. Raghavswamy, Member of Parliament

Manubhai Shah, Member of Parliament.

S. Shukla, Professor of Education, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi.

K. Subrahmanyam, Director, Institute of Defence Studies and Analysts, New Delhi

G. Subramaniam, Minister for Industrial Development and Science and Technology, Government of India.

# *The military as a target of protest*

HERBERT M. KRITZER

MOST OF THE LITERATURE ON CIVIL-MILITARY relations is concerned with the relationship of the military to the civilian political structure.<sup>1</sup> In effect, the study of civil-military relations has been confined almost solely to the interaction of two elites. There has been little study of the interaction of the military elite with the civilian mass. The assumption seems to be that all of the significant political interaction between the military elite and the civilian mass which does occur is indirect; that is, the civilian mass affects the military elite by going through the civilian elite (e.g., by electing men to office who are pledged to increase or decrease military spending) or vice versa (e.g., the military requests Congress to pass or enact a military conscription bill).

One can point to two major exceptions to this intermediary model. There have been studies of the attempt by the military to shape public opinion in order to accomplish its goals. One such attempt was the effort in the early 1950s to secure approval of a universal military training program. Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Peterson, acknowledged that government money was being used for propaganda 'to sell the program to the public with the hope that the public would sell it to Congress'.<sup>2</sup> Another area of analysis recently has been the impact of military spending on the civilian sector.<sup>3</sup> The reader will note, however, that both of these topics deal with the influence of the military on the civilian mass. There have been no studies of civilian mass-military elite interaction when that interaction is initiated by the civilians. This paper will examine one such form of interaction: civilian protest with the military as a target.<sup>4</sup>

The phenomenon of civilian protest directed at the military has become more common in recent years (though hardly an everyday occurrence). The protests that come to mind most readily have been a result of the Vietnam War. One such demonstration was the seep of the

Pentagon in October 1967.<sup>4</sup> The Pentagon had become the symbol of the warmakers and about 30,000 people came to Washington to 'vote from the warmakers'. The Vietnam War has also sparked numerous smaller demonstrations, such as blocking troop and supply trains in California, or protests at Armed Forces Day events. However, a number of protests occurred before the Vietnam War. In 1959 a group of pacifists staged a protest at a military base in Omaha, Nebraska.<sup>5</sup> In 1959-61, another group of pacifists staged a twenty-one-month vigil at Fort Detrick, near Frederick, Maryland, to protest the chemical and biological warfare research which was being conducted there.<sup>6</sup> It should be clear from the above few examples that the military may become a target of protest in two different ways. First, the military may be symbolic of a larger issue, such as the Vietnam War (the Pentagon protest). Secondly, the military may become a target of protest because of specific activities and policies, such as chemical-biological warfare policies (the Fort Detrick vigil). In the former case, the military itself is not capable of satisfying the protesters' demands, in the latter case, the military has more (though not necessarily the ultimate) authority over the subject of the protest.<sup>7</sup>

This paper will look at four separate protests where the military is the target: opposition to the stationing of Polaris submarines at Holy Loch in Scotland (1960-61), a two-day vigil at Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone to protest the involvement of the American military in Latin America (1969), a campaign against chemical-biological warfare preparations (Project CBW) focussing on the Edgewood Arsenal near Baltimore, Maryland (1970), and protests to halt the use of the Puerto Rican island of Culebra as a training target by U.S. Navy warships (1970-71). While each of these protests occurred in a different place,<sup>8</sup> in every case the target of the protest was part of American military establishment.

Since it is desirable to bring some theoretical perspective to bear on these cases, and since there is no kind of theoretical perspective on civilian non-military civil relations, various theories of protest will be used to provide insights into these phenomena. These insights, in turn, will provide some tentative generalisations regarding the military as a target of protest. Consequently, the body of this paper will consist of the following: (1) a discussion of four theories of protest; (2) a brief narrative or description of each of the four cases; (3) analysis of these cases in the light of the theories of protest, and (4) conclusions and generalisations.

### *Theories of protest*

Theoretical notions of protest have come from two distinct quarters: social scientists who are divorced from involvement in protest and

tend to approach protest from within the traditional political and social framework, and social scientists who are themselves closely identified with the protest movement and bring a less traditional perspective to bear. The latter group is generally composed of pacifists who are committed to nonviolent protest; hence, they tend to equate protest with 'nonviolent action' or 'nonviolent direct action'. While they themselves have an ethical commitment to nonviolence as a doctrine, their theories can be used to view nonviolence as a protest technique.<sup>10</sup> For this purpose, nonviolence is best described as 'the abstention from physical violence'. We will look first at two of the most traditional writers<sup>11</sup> and then two of the less traditional writers.

James Q. Wilson has suggested that protest be viewed as a problem of bargaining in which one party has nothing to use as an inducement in the traditional sense.<sup>12</sup> This definition of bargaining, and of protest, includes cases in which one side succeeds by simple persuasion or by compulsion (physical force or leaving the second party literally no other choice). In the normal bargaining process, inducements may be either positive ('if action in accordance with A's intention is made absolutely more attractive to B . . . and not because other possibilities have been made less desirable') or negative ('if action in accordance with A's intention although no more attractive absolutely than before the change was made, is nevertheless more attractive relative to other possibilities that now exist').

'Protest is distinguished from bargaining by the exclusive use of negative inducements (threats) that rely, for their effect, on sanctions which require your action or response.' In order for a protest to be successful two things are required. First, there must be a specific goal—a goal which is capable of being met. Secondly, there must be an identifiable group or agency or firm which is capable of granting the end sought; that is, there must be a specific target.<sup>13</sup> Wilson identifies four forms of protest: (1) verbal, including denunciation, campaign of adverse publicity, etc.; (2) physical, including picketing, sit-ins, and, ultimately, violence; (3) economic, such as a boycott; and (4) political, voting reprisals.<sup>14</sup>

Michael Lipicky has greatly expanded upon Wilson's notion of protest.<sup>15</sup> Protest is 'a mode of political action oriented towards objection to one or more policies or conditions, characterized by showmanship or display of an unconventional nature, and undertaken to obtain rewards from political or economic systems while working within the system'. Protest is seen as an attempt to get third parties to enter the bargaining situation, who in turn work directly with the target group on behalf of the protest group. The protest group reaches the third party through the mass media.<sup>16</sup> Thus the protest leaders must appeal to four separate constituencies simultaneously: (1) The leaders must work with and hold



together members of the protest organization with whom they may or may not share common values. (2) They must articulate goals and choose strategies so as to maximize their public exposure through the communication media. (3) They must maximize the impact of third parties in the political conflict. (4) They must try to maximize chances of success among those capable of granting the goals (i.e., the target group).<sup>17</sup> Lipky argues that the problems of 'balancing the conflicting maintenance needs of the four groups in the political process' results in an inherently unstable process.

Finally, Lipky notes that there are six tactics of response by the target group who (1) may dispense symbolic satisfactions, (2) may dispense material satisfactions, (3) may organize internally in order to blunt the impetus of protest efforts, (4) may appear to be constrained in their ability to grant protest goals, (5) may use their extensive resources to discredit protest leaders and organizations, and (6) may postpone action hoping for the protest to die out.<sup>18</sup>

Gene Sharp has done extensive work on descriptive theories of non-violent action. This has included definitions of terminology and various typologies of nonviolence.<sup>19</sup> Of interest to us is an important distinction he draws when defining nonviolent action. Nonviolent action consists of two kinds of actions on the part of the actors: '(1) acts of omission—that is, they refuse to perform acts which they usually perform and are expected by custom to perform or are required by law to perform; or (2) acts of commission—that is, they insist on performing acts which they usually do not perform, are not expected by custom to perform or are forbidden by law or regulation from performing, or (3) both'.<sup>20</sup>

George Lakoff has identified three mechanisms through which non-violent action seeks to achieve its goal.<sup>21</sup> Through coercion the protestor seeks to take away from his opponent the ability to resist his demands. The use of coercion depends upon two factors: (1) the interdependence of the protestor and the target and/or (2) availability of third parties upon whom the target is dependent and with whom the protestor may form an alliance. An example of the first of these factors in action is the typical labour strike in which workers deny the employer the labour needed to produce the goods or services which constitute his product. If the employer has a substitute source of labour available, the strikers may have to turn to the second of the two factors above. One recent example is the farm workers led by Cesar Chavez, where the growers brought in non-union laborers to replace the striking union members. Chavez called for a nationwide boycott of table grapes (and subsequently of lettuce). In this way Chavez enlisted a part of the general public as a third party ally.<sup>22</sup>

A second mechanism of nonviolent action is persuasion. As a result

of the protester's actions, the target person or group comes round to a new point of view which embraces the ends of the protester, that is, the target comes to see the protester as right and his own previous position as wrong. This is a process of attitude change, and all of the social-psychological theories about attitude change come to bear.<sup>13</sup> The Wytham Temple Road satyagraha of 1974-75 is an example of the mechanism of conversion.<sup>14</sup>

The third, and final, mechanism identified by Luker is *persuasion*. The target person or group does not change his feelings about the issue at stake, and that need not be converted, but finds that the measures necessary to resist the demands of the protester are either more 'costly' than acceding to those demands, or that such measures are abhorrent because of the cruelty involved. The former often relies upon the assurance value of the protest activity. The latter usually involves coming to see the protester in a new light because of his or her willingness to accept suffering rather than give up the struggle. The success of the women's suffrage movement is due in part to this form of persuasion.<sup>15</sup>

### *Polaris*<sup>16</sup>

In early November 1960, the United States and Britain announced an agreement for the use of Holy Loch in the Firth of Clyde as a 'sheltered anchorage' for the United States' new Polaris missile submarines. This would involve the stationing of a submarine tender, the *Proton*, at Holy Loch and frequent visits by missile carrying submarines. Members of the *Proton*'s crew and some of their families would reside in Dundee and other communities near the base. This announcement brought an immediate cry of objection from a number of groups in Britain, including the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), which had been conducting an intensive, sustained series of protests with the goal of unilateral nuclear disarmament for Britain,<sup>17</sup> the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War (DAC), and a number of socialist and leftist trade unions which were strong in Scotland.

Through the next several months numerous protest marches and rallies were held. In mid-December, 2500 persons attended a rally in Glasgow organized by the Glasgow District Trades Council. On 18 February, 3000 persons staged a sit-in at Whitehall; they handed a declaration of opposition to an official from the Ministry of Defence. Another protest was staged in Glasgow the following day. This one was led by piped bands and attracted a crowd variously estimated at from 4000 to 10,000 persons. The goal of these protests was to get the government to reverse itself and repudiate the agreement with the United States.

Throughout the time of these initial protests, planning was under way for direct action at the new base in Scotland. These protests would

have the military as a direct target. The military, particularly the United States Navy, was symbolic of the British government policies which the protesters objected to. On 22 February, DAC sent a telegram to President Kennedy warning that their supporters 'would occupy non-violently the submarines, the Proteus depot ship, and land installations. Our aim is to immobilize the base.' At the same time, DAC announced that there would be a march from London to Holy Loch between Easter and Whitson. The march would culminate in massive civil disobedience at the base at Holy Loch.<sup>10</sup>

At the same time, a group was preparing to protest the arrival of the Proteus in early March. On 2 March they had a rehearsal for their water-borne demonstration. The pacifist navy included five kayaks and two row boats. The protesters announced their plans as: 'We will cross the path of the Proteus and obstruct its entrance so that the authorities will have to remove us before they can bring the ship into the Loch. Specific acts of nonviolent civil disobedience to obstruct each of the submarines as they arrive will be carried out until May.'<sup>11</sup>

That night a group of local youths entered the protesters' camp and cut loose the boats of the pacifist navy. By the time the Proteus arrived the next morning, the boats had been recovered, and the protesters went out to meet the Proteus. One of their boats capsized and the occupants were picked up by a British naval launch. Five protesters were arrested and several of their boats were confiscated. (About a week later, charges against the five were dropped and the confiscated boats returned).<sup>12</sup>

For the next two months there were only occasional incidents at the base. March 27, three men in canoes climbed on board the submarine Patrick Henry (which had arrived March 2). Local police were summoned and the boarders were arrested. April 22, two canoists boarded the Proteus, they too were arrested. May 1, the protesters' camp was damaged in a raid by a gang of local youths; tents were slashed and burned.

Meanwhile, the march organized by DAC was under way. The march itself was largely unsuccessful.<sup>13</sup> About 35 persons made the 485 mile trek from London to Holy Loch. As they approached Dunoon in mid-May, preparations continued for massive civil disobedience when the marchers arrived on the week end of 30 May. The plans included efforts to board the Proteus and a sit-in to block the pier used by crewmen of the Proteus. The British Navy issued a warning to DAC not to attempt to board the Proteus: '(a) The planned demonstration itself is a foolhardy and dangerous venture which might result in injury or loss of life. (b) It has been stated that the physical occupation of Amsterdam Pier, Cardwell Bay Pier, and Navy Buildings Jetty will be attempted. (c) You are hereby warned that all three piers are Admiralty property guarded by Admiralty constabulary to which access by unauthorized

persons is forbidden. Again this action can only be classified as irresponsible and potentially dangerous. (d) I am further directed to warn you that the authorities can accept no responsibility for injury to persons or damage to property which may occur if the planned action whose and effect takes place."<sup>11</sup>

DAC requested permission for a delegation of members to come aboard the Proteus in order to explain the purpose of the protest to the captain. This request was denied.

The major confrontation came on 31 May. The protest navy included at least sixteen canoes, one sixty-foot launch, and a houseboat serving as a 'hospital' ship. Numerous efforts were made to board the Proteus. One man succeeded in climbing a greased anchor chain, he was arrested. Other persons who attempted to board were met with a high powered water hose, and were knocked into the water where they were picked up by police launches. Persons in pleasure craft who opposed the demonstration tried to harass the protesters by churning up heavy wakes and crossing the path of the protesters' boats. Nine canoists were eventually arrested and eight canoes were confiscated. About 70 persons had been involved in the attempts to board the Proteus.

Meanwhile, 200 other protesters attempted to disembark Ardsadam pier, the pier used by the crewmen of the Proteus. Police arrested 32 persons in an effort to clear a path on the pier.<sup>12</sup> This sit-in finally ended after 22 hours.

This protest was the climax of the Polaris action. The summer saw occasional incidents and the trials of those arrested in May. One final large demonstration occurred on 17 September. Three hundred and fifty-one persons were arrested in a sit-in at Ardsadam pier. Another 600 persons had been prevented from coming by bad weather.

The Polaris action was unsuccessful in preventing the stationing of missile submarines in Scotland, as was the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in general. This was not due to lack of media coverage. Rather, the *Economist* suggests, the protests, as they were reported in the media, may have alienated some groups who previously had tended to support the idea of unilateral disarmament (e.g., the Labour Party and trade union groups): "the ordinary trade unionist thinks that it is plain daft for anybody to express a political viewpoint by sitting down in the street".<sup>13</sup> This alienation had been reflected earlier by several leaders of a protest march against the Holy Loch base by trade unions on 14 May. One leader was quoted as saying that the 'best help [DAC] could give them in Scotland was by going back to London'.<sup>14</sup>

#### *Footnote<sup>11</sup>*

On 19 and 20 March 1982, A Quaker Action Group (AQAG) staged a two-day vigil at Port Guelick in the Panama Canal Zone. A teach-out

was held simultaneously at the Inter-American Defense College located at Fort Leslie J. McNair in Washington, D.C., on 19 March. There were two purposes behind these actions. First, the action was to be the beginning of a long campaign to help educate the American people about the U.S. military and economic penetration of Latin America. Second, AQAG wanted to affirm support of those Latin Americans who were considering the possibilities of nonviolent action in their struggle for social justice. The protesters had no specific sets of demands, and the focus on the military was for symbolic reasons. The protest could just as easily have been directed at American oil or mining interests who are involved in the exploitation of Latin America.

It was for symbolic reasons that the Panama Canal Zone was selected for the site of the protest. The Canal Zone is the 'nerve centre' of the United States military forces in Latin America. At the Pacific end of the Zone is the headquarters for the U.S. Armed Forces Southern Command, which directs all U.S. military programs in Latin America. On the Atlantic side is Fort Sherman, site of the U.S. Army Jungle Warfare School. Nearby is Fort Gulick, home of the School of the Americas and the 1st Special Forces Contingent.<sup>40</sup>

The vigil involved a team of 13 plus one photographer participant. Word of the impending protest preceded the arrival of the demonstrators. Two front-page newspaper articles had appeared in the local press. In the course of the vigil, the demonstrators met with both hostility and sympathy. The form of the protest was a silent vigil and leafleting; individuals left the vigil line to speak to passersby, argue with others who sought them out. The protesters carried four signs, one of which said, 'Quakers Say No Violence in Latin America'.

The vigil itself was quite uneventful. The vigilers were confronted with obscene gestures and sympathetic V-signs, heard things like 'eat shit' from middle-aged white women and 'peace, brother' from GIs, and were assaulted by the tropical sun and the insects. The only interesting occurrence was the arrival of a young soldier, out of the uniform on his day off. He had hitch-hiked over from another base in the Canal Zone, having read of the protest in the local newspaper. The vigilers immediately established rapport with him though he did not join the vigil line, he hoped to spend the rest of the day with the vigilers. The MPs, however, had different plans. The Young GI was detained for wearing improper attire (he was wearing forbidden blue jeans). After being held for an hour, he was driven back to his post for a reprimand.

The supporting action in Washington, D.C., drew over 100 people for the teach-out and a vigil. Normally, Fort McNair is an open base. However, the demonstrators were informed by the base commander that they would not be permitted on the base; they would be prevented from entering, by force if necessary. Since the organizers were more interested

in holding a march-out than in having a confrontation, they moved the site of the demonstration outside the gates of Fort McNair. After some difficulty, they were able to secure a permit from the Washington police to use a nearby park. (The permit was granted only after the organizers indicated that the march-out would be held, permit or no permit.) The march-out lasted from noon to 6:00 p.m. A number of speeches were made, and telegrams of support were received from two Congressmen; in addition, leaflets were distributed to many passersby.

Two members of the team that went to the Canal Zone prepared an evaluation of the project. They reached the following conclusions: (1) The vigil had had some impact in Panama through the coverage by the local press. However, it failed to have a wider impact because of the lack of coverage outside of Panama. (2) Many Panamanians expressed 'respect and appreciation for the action'. (3) There was little understanding of nonviolent action as a strategy for social change. And (4) 'the Fort Gulick demonstration should have continued beyond two days.

... The demonstration had only begun to stir public interest when it was ended. ... A continuation of the demonstration for several more days would have stirred greater interest and understanding among Panamanians and might well have brought a breakthrough in the news blackout over the rest of Latin America.<sup>14</sup>

Clearly, the action failed in its first goal, it did not succeed in launching a massive re-evaluation of the American role in Latin America. The action did not create enough publicity to launch that re-evaluation on its own nor had AQAG made plans to continue the project after the initial protest. The action was only slightly more successful in its second goal, since word of the protest did not spread throughout Latin America, support to indigenous activists could only have gone to those in Panama. One member of the project team did go on to a seminar on nonviolence in Mexico immediately after the protest; also, AQAG subsequently became involved in another protest action in Puerto Rico (described below) which, when combined with the Panama vigil, may have had at least some of the supportive effect.

### *Project CBW<sup>15</sup>*

Project CBW was first suggested by one of the younger members of AQAG. He had attended a conference in Stockholm where he heard reports of the extensive use of chemicals in Vietnam. His initial suggestion was for a long-term project beginning with organizing of a general educational nature. The idea of a project focused on CBW was appealing to many members of the group. Some of the leaders of the 1959-61 vigil at Fort Detrick had been involved in organizing AQAG.

The goal of the project as it was finally conceived was to mobilize opinion in order to ban CBW, particularly emphasizing its use as

Vietnam. It was organized and carried out by AQAG, though it was nominally co-sponsored by number of other peace groups. The project was formally launched on 30 May 1970, and lasted until 3 October 1970, with the greatest activity from 1 July to 18 July and again from 29 September to 3 October. It involved a core group of 20 persons though as many as 150 were present for one-day periods.<sup>40</sup>

Weekly actions were started in Washington on 30 May. These included street speaking, leafleting and guerrilla theatre.<sup>41</sup> On 12 June the Pentagon was leafleted, and four persons were arrested for trying to distribute leaflets inside the building. During this period final plans and negotiations for the body of the project were completed. The project would consist of two phases. Phase I involved a march to Fort Detrick and Edgewood Arsenal. The specific goal of this phase was to plant three trees: one at the Ellipse in Washington, one on military property at Fort Detrick but outside the main gate, and one inside the main gate at Edgewood Arsenal. Civil disobedience was anticipated at Edgewood. This effort would provide publicity and a mobilization for Phase II, which would consist of massive demonstrations and educational efforts on a national basis hopefully resulting in a ban on CW activities in the United States.

The symbol of Phase I became the tree. The tree had come to symbolize many things including life, liberation and revolution. Activities revolved around the slogan, 'The tree is coming'.

The march began on 1 July with the planting of the tree, with permission of the National Park Service, at the Ellipse. The march itself was largely uneventful. The time was spent getting acquainted with one another, there was some interaction with non-marchers along the way, particularly with members of the churches where the marchers stayed along the route. There were occasional hecklers and some verbal abuse, but the incidents were minor. Along the way, subgroups made side trips to Grace and Company, a firm thought to have a CW contract, and to University of Maryland to talk to officials about CW research contracts held by the Department of Microbiology. The group passed for a sleep vigil at the Calonsville draft board where the Berrigans had led one of the first draft board raids. The one major event staged along the march route was a rally at Fort MeHenry in Baltimore which drew about 300 persons (the main attraction was Pete Seeger).

On 8 July in Baltimore the group split with 10 or 12 heading towards Fort Detrick and the rest continuing to Edgewood. The Fort Detrick group arrived on 9 July. The group had received permission to plant the tree outside of the main gate on base property. This was done to 'celebrate and encourage the intended change of Fort Detrick into a health research centre/which had been announced by President Nixon earlier'.<sup>42</sup> After the tree planting, this group rejoined the main group at Edgewood

Arsonist.

The group arrived at Edgewood Arsenal around noon on Wednesday 8 July. They had been denied permission to plant the tree inside the base gate, though permission was granted to plant the tree on a grassy knoll outside the gate but on base property. This was rejected by the protesters. A 24-hour vigil was begun to give the base commander a chance to reconsider. A picnic and a meeting for worship were held on the knoll which had become the base of operations.

On Thursday civil disobedience began. The demonstrators expected to be charged with trespass, which involved a maximum sentence of six months and/or \$500. The group decided to attempt to enter the base in small groups (about four persons). The small number was decided on (1) to not be a threat to the MPs and allow for personal interaction with them, and (2) to stretch out the possibility of sustained civil disobedience with the hope of attracting others to join.<sup>12</sup> At 1 p.m. the first group attempted to enter the gates; they were pushed back and the gates were shut. The demonstrators sat down in front of the gates. They remained there for several hours. It eventually became clear that the gates would have to be opened in order for the employees to go home for the day. Around 4 the gates were reopened and the small group of demonstrators walked through. After a few feet they were apprehended by MPs; they all cooperated with arrest. The tree was confiscated.

Before the rush of ones began, a second group tried to enter with another tree and were also apprehended. The tree was left in the middle of the roadway. Eventually it was hit by a car and the pot was split open. After the cars had left, a third group tried to enter the base in order to retrieve and plant the second group's tree. They were apprehended before they could reach the tree.

Finally, a man in civilian clothes retrieved the tree and returned it to the demonstrators on the grassy knoll saying, 'you'd better plant it before it dries'.<sup>13</sup> This was done and the group retired for the evening. That night the fourteen persons who had been arrested were arraigned. Five were released on bail or recognizance, the rest chose to remain in jail.

On Friday the protesters returned to the knoll area. After the first group of the day had attempted to enter the base (and had been duly arrested), the group on the knoll was ordered off base property (i.e., the knoll). After some discussion the group decided 'it was far more significant to be arrested while trying to plant the tree inside the arsenal than while defending territory, which after all [was] the army's game',<sup>14</sup> and so moved back a few feet.

The next civil disobedience group was consciously an all women's group. This apparently caught the MPs off-guard since the women were able to get far enough to start digging (with teaspoons since shovels were



never taken inside the gates as they might have been threatening in the MP's before being apprehended. They were followed by a third group who were also arrested. All of the arrested, including the nine from the previous day still being held, were released.

The group decided not to attempt the tree planting on the week end. This would give both themselves and the base personnel a couple of days' rest.<sup>11</sup> On Monday only one group attempted to enter the base. They were detained and then released without an order to appear for trial. On Tuesday, a spokesman for the protesters was allowed to enter the base to attempt to negotiate with a base spokesman. The base spokesman refused to allow the demonstrators to enter to plant their tree, and criticized the offer to allow them to plant the tree outside the base gate but on base property. This was rejected by the protesters. Another small group then attempted to enter the base without permission and were stopped, they too were detained a few hours and released without an order to appear for trial.

On Wednesday 13 July, a compromise agreement was reached. The deputy post commander agreed to accept a tree and plant it on the base as part of the post beautification program. The group of protesters would plant another tree on the grassy knoll.<sup>12</sup> On Thursday the group of protesters staged a rally in downtown Baltimore featuring a mock trial of the tree. As the tree stood mute, paper-chained to a barstool, various arguments were presented in prosecution and defense. At the end, the judge left the decision to the individual commissioners of the hyattsville. After the rally, the group proceeded to the arsenal, and planted the tree on the knoll. Another tree was presented to a base official who accepted it saying, "I accept this tree as a tree to help beautify this post, not as a symbol of your movement".<sup>13</sup>

With the planting of the tree at Edgewood, Phase I of Project CBW came to an end. Work began immediately on Phase II. The first actual protest action of Phase II occurred at Fort Detrick on 29 September. A group had written to the base commander requesting to make an inspection tour of the base since it was supposedly in the process of eliminating its secret research. This was refused. Several groups of protesters attempted to enter the base anyhow. They were apprehended, given letters of detainment (formal notice that they were persona non grata), warned that they would be prosecuted if they returned, and thrown off the base.

The group then proceeded to Edgewood. They requested permission to enter the base to knoll and visit the tree. This was refused. These protesters entered anyhow and were apprehended. They were detained and then released.

On 30 September, the focus shifted to the Pentagon. The group had sought permission to plant a tree in Pentagon Park in the centre of

the Pentagon. This request was refused, but six other sites near the Mall entrance were approved. Nine persons attempted to go ahead with the tree planting in the Pentagon Park but were arrested before they could get there. (All were released that afternoon on bail.) Six or seven other members of the group went ahead and planted a tree in one of the approved areas. The next day two more groups tried unsuccessfully to reach Pentagon Park to plant a tree. (They, too, were released on bail that afternoon.) After the arrests, the rest of the group planted another legal tree. By Friday, the group had exhausted its supply of persons willing to commit civil disobedience; that day the remaining members of the group planted four more trees in designated areas. The demonstration ended that day after the protesters insulted employees as they left for the day.

During October and November, seven additional anti-CBW events took place across the country. These included a radio broadcast, teaching, and kneeling.<sup>10</sup>

What can one say about the success of Project CBW? In all but its most simple and immediate goals (planting trees), it was a failure. The overall goal of the project had been to mobilize public opinion against chemical-biological warfare. The project failed for two reasons. First, the project failed to produce any substantial nationwide publicity. The demonstrations at Edgewood produced substantial quantities of publicity in the Baltimore area but none of the national media picked it up. Only the first day of demonstrations at the Pentagon produced coverage by the national media. Second, AQAQ had done no planning as to how to capitalize on what publicity it did receive once the demonstrations had come to an end. As a result, the issue of chemical-biological warfare dropped from view as a public issue once the demonstrations were over.

### Culebra<sup>11</sup>

Culebra is a small island off Puerto Rico with less than 1000 residents. In 1901 and 1902 Presidential Executive Orders were signed that reserved all public lands on Culebra and adjacent cays for use of the U.S. Government under Navy jurisdiction. A later executive order had the result of requiring all private planes and ships to obtain special permission from the Navy in order to approach or leave the island (which is one of 76 municipalities of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico). The island is used by the Navy as a practice target for ship to shore gunnery training and strafing practice by Navy pilots. Since 1954 the Navy has wanted to buy the entire island, but this has been resisted by the residents.

In the spring of 1978, the issue came to a head. The Navy modified its proposal for land acquisition on the island. It offered to return 680 acres to civilian control, but requested a new assessment of 2330

area of what then was private property used for grazing. At the same time the Navy was intensifying its shelling of the island. In fiscal year (FY) 1969, the Navy anticipated 5,000 bombardment sorties. This was expected to climb to 8,000 sorties in FY 1970. What this meant was that the island was being subjected to bombardment for an average of 9½ hours per day, Monday through Saturday, and 3½ hours on Sunday.

By mid-March feelings on the island were running quite high. A poll of 313 families showed 309 supporting a request by the mayor that the Navy leave the island. Following the poll, islanders marched to the local command post with an ultimatum to leave or face direct action. A few days earlier, a federal appeals court had upheld a lower court ruling affirming the Navy's right to use Culebra. On 26 March, the Puerto Rican Senate passed a unanimous resolution asking President Nixon to 're-examine the Navy's activities in Culebra for the purpose of assuring the residents . . . peace, order, free movement, and development of economic interests'.<sup>11</sup> These events resulted in a considerable amount of national publicity for the Culebrans' cause. Their plight was best summarized in a letter from a Navy official to a land developer interested in building vacation condominiums on Culebra: 'Culebra Island is a keystone in the Atlantic Fleet weapons range, which encompasses Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, nearby Vieques Island, and thousands of square miles of ocean area. This large complex is expanding and operations are becoming increasingly intensive, frequently being conducted through seven days of the week. As such our increases, takeaways of nearby areas such as your property will be subjected to the noise of supersonic booms, gunfire, rocketfire, and heavy air traffic.'<sup>12</sup>

What the letter fails to mention is that the entire island is a 'near-by area'. The main town of Dewey, where many residents of the island live, is within two miles of the target impact area.

Throughout the spring and summer a number of activities continued. Congressional hearings and investigations were made.<sup>13</sup> The Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP) held a three-day encampment in the impact area.<sup>14</sup> Starting as a small project, it grew to more than 600 participants. The Navy cancelled scheduled exercises only fifteen minutes before firing time. On 10 June, a group of twenty Culebrans stood in the target area and forced an Italian ship to cancel ship-to-ship gunnery practice.

Actions were not confined to the protesters. The Navy, at the urging of some Congressmen, tried to mollify the residents by offering 35 relatively high paying jobs. However, some of the jobs were snatched up by lower paid municipal employees who heard about them first and refused to take the higher paying jobs. This served to create more antagonism. Another incident, which did not occur until December, also served to heighten tensions. When the Navy started an underwater

demolition operation to clear an area of unexploded ammunition, Culebras 'plotted' the intended explosion point with three boats. After the commander ordered a team member to "pull the pin", two of the boats retreated but three women who had brought out of the boat refused to leave. The boat was hastily towed away just before the explosion.<sup>14</sup>

During the fall, an idea crystallized for a concerted protest action. Many years before, a Methodist chapel had existed on Flamingo Beach; it had been demolished when the beach became part of the Navy's training area. The plan was to build a non-denominational chapel in the target area in defiance of the Navy. The idea was developed by an informal local group, the Rescue Culebras Committee (RCC). Three other organizations came together to bring the plan to fruition: the Clergy Committee to Rescue Culebras, PIP, and AQAG. PIP saw the protest as part of its larger struggle to end U.S. dominance in Puerto Rico. AQAG saw its involvement as part of its opposition to U.S. military and economic involvement in Latin America, and thus as a complement to the action in Panama two years earlier; furthermore, AQAG saw itself providing the necessary link between Puerto Rico and the mainland. The plans were announced jointly in San Juan and New York on 4 January 1971. The chapel building would commence on 18 January, the date Operation Springboard, a massive training manoeuvre involving four NATO countries, four Latin American countries, 60,000 troops, 70 ships, and 180 planes, was to begin.

The Navy attempted to head off the demonstration by offering to sign a 'peace treaty' with the Culebrans.<sup>15</sup> The Navy offered to phase out nearly all target areas, refrain from firing on weekends and Sundays 'except in most urgent operational commitments', and promised to search for 'feasible alternatives' for training operations. In return, the governor, mayor and others would 'use all regulatory and legal devices available to the Commonwealth and the Municipality of Culebra to assure that no dwellings or other habitable structures are constructed in the northwest safety zone for as long as the Navy uses the northwest peninsula for naval gunfire support training'. Furthermore, these same parties would 'use their best efforts, including moral suasion, to obtain the cooperation of everyone in keeping the land and sea safety zones for the remaining targets clear of people during scheduled training operations'.<sup>16</sup>

The treaty was presented at a hastily called meeting on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. If the Culebrans could not agree, the Navy would deny that the proposal existed. The proposal was read in English, and translated into Spanish. No copy was left on the island after the meeting for use by the islanders in discussing the proposal.

The mayor decided to go ahead and sign. However, there was a great deal of confusion over exactly what the provisions of the treaty

was. The mayor believed that it "guaranteed the return of all land used by the Navy on Culebra." The Navy had actually pledged only to look for other feasible sites, if none could be found, the Navy would stay. Despite this confusion, the signing ceremony, attended by dignitaries such as the Secretary of the Navy and the Governor of Puerto Rico, went ahead. The treaty was denounced by PIP and AQAG, and plans for the chapel building went ahead. Before the week's end, RCC also repudiated the treaty, complaining that the letter and spirit of the agreement were being broken.

Between the treaty signing and the day the chapel building was to commence, workers erected a cyclone fence blocking off part of Flamingo Beach where the chapel was to be built. According to the commander from Roosevelt Roads, this was "to prevent innocent people from going out there and getting blown up" and because "we [the Navy] knew this confrontation was going to come up and we definitely did want to keep him [Bernier, leader of PIP] out . . . we wanted to have a clear demarcation line."<sup>10</sup> On 18 January the protesters marched the two miles from Dewey to the fence. There they were greeted by police who warned them that trespassers would be arrested. Six people decided to go ahead and enter, they went down to the water's edge and around the fence. When nothing happened to them, others in the group started carrying in the building materials. Some men tried to take away some two-by-fours and were engaged in a tug of war. The protesters emerged victorious and spent the next two days building the chapel.

Shelling was scheduled to start on Thursday 21 January. At 8:30 a.m., U.S. marshalls delivered a temporary restraining order directing the protesters not to interfere with the Navy and ordering them to leave the area. A dedicatory service for the chapel was held and all but six of the demonstrators, representative of the groups involved in the protest, left the restricted area. These six would commit civil disobedience. The marshalls returned several times to reiterate the court order, but the six remained. Finally that night, after the news reporters had left for the night, the six were arrested. They were flown to San Juan, arraigned and released. When they emerged from the court house, they were greeted by nearly a thousand demonstrators.

The shellings scheduled for Friday were cancelled while legal maneuvering continued, thus the protesters succeeded in blocking that week's shelling of Culebra. The following week saw numerous skirmishes and confrontations. The following, described by reporter Bill Wingell, was typical: "Four more demonstrators entered the target area, slipping around the Navy fence under cover of darkness, and again delayed the firing until being arrested and taken to San Juan like their predecessors. This time, however, even as the four were being driven out of the zone in a Navy truck under armed guard, three more protesters slipped by the

force (it extends into the bay but can be waded around) and took up their vigil in the target area.'

One youth, Luis Alonzo, 23, managed to get away from his Navy guards, moving further into the two-mile-long firing zone. Two Canadian destroyers, the HMCS Ottawa and Saint Laurent, were ordered to halt their shelling while Navy search parties sought Alonzo.

The delay lasted four hours. Finally, the ships started firing again, despite the fact that Alonzo was still in the target area. Twenty minutes after the resumption of shelling, the youth walked out of his own accord. 'I just got tired', he told this reporter. He said he had hidden in two different trees, and although helicopters and ground parties had passed right by him, he had not been spotted. 'That's why they're losing in Vietnam', he said.<sup>10</sup>

On the night of 29 January, the chapel mysteriously fell down. The Navy claimed it had blown down, but there was evidence that it had been pulled down. It was rebuilt by a group of Calibranes.<sup>11</sup> On weekends Calibranes came down to the beach to hold religious services, usually outside the fence but on at least one occasion in the chapel.

By 3 February, the Navy had had enough. The chapel was inspected by a 'structural engineering team' who declared it a safety hazard. The marines took the chapel down piece by piece and bulldozed the site. This incident touched off the only violence, on the part of the protesters, during the campaign. When the crowd tried to move in to save the chapel, marines responded with tear gas. Several molotov cocktails were thrown, and three marines were burned. Finally, Puerto Rican police arrived, as did the mayor, and the crowd was persuaded to disperse. Now only the fence remained. To it the Calibranes fashioned an improvised cross and a sign which read 'you took down a chapel but you can't destroy the spirit that builds it over again'.<sup>12</sup>

On 13 February, fourteen persons came to trial for contempt of court, i.e., refusing to leave the target area. Each was sentenced to three months in jail. After the trial, many demonstrations were held. A daily vigil at the prison where the protesters were held attracted as many as 4000 persons. The week after the trial more protesters interrupted Operation Springboard. In Washington, a support demonstration was held. A replica of the chapel, built as a protestor supporting demonstration at the Pentagon, was carried to some of the embassies of the nations participating in Operation Springboard. On 15 March, Calibranes celebrated the first anniversary of their march to the local command post with their ultimatum to the Navy.

Finally on 30 March, the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Pentagon announced that the Navy would cease using live ammunition for its training maneuvers on Calibran as of 1 January 1973. Furthermore, the Navy promised to try to leave entirely by June 1973. This latter

provision was contingent upon several things, such as the Navy being able to find another area for its gunnery range, and a poll of Culbrenn to be taken later to determine whether they really want the Navy to leave.<sup>41</sup>

The Culbrenns appear to have won their demands; the protests were a success. This is the only one of the four protests which was clearly a success; how did it differ? First, and most important, the goal was concrete and specific. And second, the protesters used creative techniques and were able to attract a fair amount of national publicity.

### *Analysis*

The first thing which these cases make clear is that protest with the military as a target must involve acts of commission rather than acts of omission. Since the normal contact between the military elite and the civilian man is minimal or non-existent, there is no opportunity for acts of omission—there is simply nothing to omit. This places the necessity for initiative with the protesters. They must invent something to do that will have an impact; that is, they must be creative. They can build a chapel, or try to plant a tree, or launch a pacifist navy. More common tactics, such as marches, vigils, or rallies will only attract attention to the cause if such actions attract massive numbers of persons. Thus a thirteen-person vigil in Panama attracts a lot of attention—vigils are an unusual event in Panama—but not even a notice in the United States where vigils are an everyday occurrence.

Success through coercion is very unlikely, even if the protest is non-violent. First, when it comes to ability to coerce, the military is king; violence is always at their disposal. However, in dealing with a non-violent protest, the use of physical violence is unnecessary. Through the disciplined, sustained response made possible by the military's structure as well as the material resources the military can mobilize, it is possible to outlast an attempt at nonviolent coercion. For example, even if protesters were able to block entrances to a military installation and deny access to supply vehicles, the military has the ability to airlift needed supplies. Second, if necessary, the military can pretend that the protest does not exist, and go on with its daily routine; that is, the military is relatively independent of the civilian world for its daily existence. The latter step is possible only if the military can effectively exclude the protesters from the area it seeks to utilize. Culbrenn would appear to involve one of the few instances where the military was unable, or unwilling, to deny access to the protesters.

The only way that coercion is likely to be effective is if it can be combined with a process of conversion, not conversion of the military elite—which I would consider virtually impossible—but rather conversion of the military man, i.e., the enlisted men with whom the protesters are

most likely to have direct contact. The enlisted men are the least committed to the military's goals and would be the most susceptible to conversion attempts. This conversion would involve bringing the enlisted men around to the viewpoint of the protesters in the hope that he will either defect or refuse to carry out orders directed against the protesters. However, for this to be successful, it must be done on a massive scale, and this is not likely to happen. Once the military elite becomes aware that such a process is occurring, it can respond by forbidding the enlisted men to have verbal contact with the protesters, or, better, frequently rotate the men so that there is insufficient time for the conversion process to take place. In some situations, it might be possible for the military to utilize men who do not speak the same language as the protesters, this would greatly hamper the conversion process (particularly if the military refrained from using violence which might gain sympathy for the protesters). Moreover, few protests have been launched which were sufficiently massive or sustained to have enough of this conversion effect to be significant.<sup>43</sup>

Protests against the military are most likely to be successful if the demands are relatively small and do not involve issues of broad policy, and if the protests can be a nuisance to the military. This involves both Lakay's idea of persuasion and Wilson's idea of bargaining (though the two are not quite synonymous). In effect, if the costs to the military of the protests continuing are higher than the costs of acceding to the protesters' demands, the military will probably either give in or try to reach compromise. First, however, the military must be convinced that the protest will continue indefinitely; if the military believes they can easily win out the protesters, they will maintain their position. As Waldman points out in his analysis of Project CBW, one of the leaders of the project, known to the military, had previously led a twenty-one-month vigil at Fort Detrick, furthermore, the military did not know that the protesters had almost run out of persons willing to commit civil disobedience. Consequently, the military 'recognized the possibility that the project at Edgewood might result in a long action continuously taxing the base for many months'.<sup>44</sup>

The success on Culebra is at least partially due to this same process. The interference at the firing range had created many problems for the Navy, guards had to be stationed there and numerous gunnery exercises had to be cancelled. The spirit of resistance on the island was rising. The Navy may have hoped that destroying the chapel would break that spirit, however, it served to increase the spirit of the islanders, the one group capable of sustaining the protest for many months. Furthermore, a sustained protest may have jeopardized the Navy's position in the case of Puerto Rico.<sup>45</sup>

Once the military is persuaded that the protests are not likely to end



quickly, the bargaining process described by Wilson can begin; the protesters have a resource with which to bargain (i.e., discontinuing the protest). It is also interesting that in both cases where the protest met with a measure of success, the other elements Wilson argues as being necessary for success are present. In both Culebra and Project CBW there was a fairly specific goal, one that was easily met. Also, in both situations there was an identifiable person with the authority to grant the protesters' requests (the base commander in the case of Project CBW and the Secretary of the Navy in the Culebra action).

Lipsky's theory of protest is particularly important in understanding the success or failure of protest aimed at changing broad policies; these are likely to be the situations where the military is chosen as a target primarily for symbolic reasons. For such policies as American involvement in Latin America to be modified, massive mobilization of public opinion is necessary. Once this is accomplished, the public enters the bargaining process by threatening to withhold votes from leaders supporting the objectionable policy unless that policy is changed. None of the cases discussed in this paper involved in the massive opinion mobilization necessary for change. In fact, in the Feltus action the tactics used by the protesters may have mobilized a large segment of public opinion against the policy change they were advocating. This will be discussed more below.

Lipsky's theory is also applicable to the Culebra action. The media coverage received by the Culebrans did result in third parties entering the conflict on their behalf, primarily Congressmen. It is doubtful if the Culebrans would have been successful without Congressional support. Then again, it is doubtful if they would have been successful if the military had thought it could outlast the protests.

This suggests the limited applicability of Lipsky's theory to protests in which the military is the direct target. The military is relatively insulated from most third party groups who might enter the bargaining process on behalf of the protesters. The one major group which can effectively bargain with the military is Congress. All other groups (e.g., the public at large) would have to go through the Congress.<sup>11</sup> Obviously, the protesters could try to bring Congress into the bargaining process indirectly by first reaching a segment of the public willing to exert pressure on Congress. However, once this kind of process is involved, the protest process becomes much more difficult, and probably has a much lower chance of success. This is not to say that bargaining in protests with the military as a direct target is limited to Congress; however, the bargaining process involved is the one described by Wilson in which the protesters secure their own resource through the protest itself.

Finally, Lipsky's observation that the protest process is inherently unstable is clearly borne out in at least two of the cases described in this

paper. In the Polarix action, the problem of balancing constituencies resulted in the failure of the protest movement. The need to secure publicity required the protest leaders to find relatively dramatic tactics such as the pacifist navy and the sit-ins at Whitehall and Achnacarry Pier. This tactic, in turn, alienated many of the third party allies on whom the protesters relied for success, i.e. the trade unionists. Project CBW also met with many leadership problems though they have not been discussed in this paper. Problems of leadership style and the need for a decision making group caused tensions within the protest group. Many of the persons involved were committed to a non-elitist egalitarian form of decision making. The problem was especially acute in planning for Phase II. Because of this emphasis on non-elitism, all persons who were interested, a total of twelve, stayed on to work on planning for Phase II. The leaders of the protest knew that this was too large a group to work effectively, and before a month was out, the number had dwindled to two. The resulting demoralization was in part responsible for the ending of the project after the Pentagon protests in October.

### *Conclusions*

When considering the military as a target of protest, one must be careful to distinguish whether the military is merely a symbol of some large issue or if the military itself is capable of meeting the demands of the protesters. In the case of a larger issue, specific demands placed upon the military, such as accepting the test as Project CBW, can be viewed as a demand that the military is capable of meeting itself. Generally, however, the two types of protests with the military as a target have different means for planning, execution, and analysis.

When the military is primarily a symbol of the larger issues with which the protest is concerned, the protest differs in no appreciable way from any protest concerned with large, probably ideological, issues, e.g., CND. The best model for viewing this kind of protest is Lipset's in which the protesters seek to mobilize the general public, or a segment of the general public, as a third party by going through the mass media. In terms of their primary goals, both project CBW and the Panama action attempted to work through this kind of mechanism. As Lipset points out, this kind of protest is inherently unstable because of the conflicting demands and pressures of the various constituencies involved. Thus we see that the Polarix action was dramatically unsuccessful, and probably spelled the end of CND, because its leaders either failed to consider, or were unable to consider, the 'demands' of the trade unionists who were the campaign's major allies.

When the protesters have demands that can be met directly by the military, Wilson's theory of protest is probably more appropriate. The

military is largely insulated from potential third parties, and so the protesters must seek to bargain directly with the military. This is done by creating a 'nuisance' which is more 'costly' to the military than is according to the protesters' demands. In this way, Project CBW was able to get its tree planted at Edgewood.

A truly successful protest of the latter type can be viewed best by combining Lipsky's and Wilson's theories. This is the case with the Calabans action. The Calabans were able through media coverage, particularly early on before the chapel was even thought of, to secure powerful allies in Congress, and in the Puerto Rican Senate. These Congressmen in turn, were able to bargain directly with the Navy; the support of the Puerto Rican Senate made it clear to the Navy that the Calabans situation might bring their entire operation in Puerto Rico into question. The protest activities on the island, meanwhile, were making the Navy's continued use of the island extremely difficult. The Navy was forced to erect many churches and to station a number of men on the island for the sole purpose of keeping the target zone clear of civilians. Furthermore, the Navy was not successful in keeping the civilians out, and ran the risk of a major incident if someone were killed or injured on the beach during gunnery training. Thus the protesters had secured a resource which could be used for purposes of direct bargaining with the Navy.

---

(1) Work supported in part by National Institute of Mental Health Grant 5 RO1 MH117421-02 SR.

1. See for example S. S. Fains, *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1963); S. P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), and D. M. Held, 'A Topology of Military Organizations', *Public Policy Yearbook*, (1978) 3-48.

2. Quoted in Sidney Levy, *The Military-Industrial Complex* (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1976) 27. See also, J. W. Palfreigh, *The Foreign Propaganda Machine* (New York: Liveright, 1966), and Derek Sheuren, 'The Foreign Propaganda Machine', in L. S. Rothberg and D. Shauer (eds.) *The Foreign Propaganda Machine* (Quincy: Dryden Press, 1970) 127-137, and Jerry Holmsworth and Gary Auld, 'An Alternative Answer to "Who Pays for Defense"', *61 American Political Science Review* (September 1971): 768-769.

3. See Bruce M. Russett, *White Paper: Exposed! The Burden of National Defense* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970) 127-137, and Jerry Holmsworth and Gary Auld, 'An Alternative Answer to "Who Pays for Defense"', *61 American Political Science Review* (September 1971): 768-769.

4. The one major exception to this has been the study of universal national defense. However, this topic deals with civilian non-military civic interaction in crisis situations such as invasion or coup d'état. For discussion of non-civic national defense, see Adam Roberts (ed.) *Civilian Resistance as a National Defense* (Belmont: Progress Books, 1972), or for a recent example, see Philip Woodrow and Adam Roberts, *Conscientiousness 1950: Reform, Repression and Resistance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

3. See the newspaper and magazine accounts reprinted in A.F. Sharp and H.M. Weinberg (eds.) *Nonviolent Direct Action* (Washington: Campus Books, 1964) 241-273, or Norman Mailer, *Armies of the Night* (New York: New American Library, 1969).
4. See William J. Young, *Mobile Witness: A Testimony for Racial Peace Action* (Penguin-Hol) Pamphlet 118, 1961) 3-17, and Neil Humeoff, *Peace Apathist: The Story of A.J. Moore* (New York: Macmillan, 1963) 3-4, 132-138; and 'The Call', 4 *Gandhi Story* (April 1962) 177-189.
5. See Seymour Hersh, *Chimboel and Biological Warfare* (New York: Doubleday, 1969) 161-162, and 4 *Gandhi Story* (April 1962) 173-175.
6. It is interesting to look at the protests against the Vietnam War for the symbolism of the target involved. The first few mass demonstrations occurred in New York. New York can be seen as a centre of public opinion generation and the first few demonstrations aimed primarily at mobilizing public opinion. The first major demonstration in Washington was the Pentagon demonstration; the war was the fault of the military and attention was to be focused on the evil-doers. The next two demonstrations, November 1964 and May 1965, were staged at the Washington Monument, the focus was the White House across the street. The demonstrators were demanding (in November) that President Nixon set a date for total U.S. withdrawal, and (in May) that President Nixon order the Cambodian rivers to be closed. By the time of the next major demonstration, April 1971, President Nixon had been given up as hopeless. The demonstration took place at the Capitol and the demand was for Congress to set a date for withdrawal.
7. One cannot say that they occurred in different 'quarters' since three of the four locations are part of or controlled by the United States.
8. See Theodor Ebert, 'Nonviolence: Doctrine or Technique?', 11 *Gandhi Story* (July 1967) 231-260, and Herbert Kruse, 'Nonviolence: Definitions', (Harvard College Center for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution NVA Project, Report No. 15 February 1971).
9. Both of these writers were primarily concerned with civil rights protests, though there is no reason that their theories do not have a wider applicability.
10. James Q. Wilson, 'The Strategy of Protest: Problems of Negro Civil Action', 3 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (1964) 281-303.
11. Ibid., 282.
12. Ibid., 284.
13. Michael Lapsky, 'Protest as a Political Resource', 61 *American Political Science Review* (December 1966) 1044-1058.
14. Ibid., 1047.
15. Ibid., 1044-1046.
16. Ibid., 1025-1026, it is not clear if Lapsky includes in category six simply quoting the protest; also, one can argue that there is another factor—to accept the protest leader's
17. Gene Sharp, 'The Meanings of Nonviolence: A Typology', 3 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (March 1959) 41-64, in *A Dictionary of Nonviolent Action and Christian Defense* (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1970), *Exploring Nonviolent Alternatives* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1970). Sharp has in press a book which will deal in part with the dynamics of nonviolent action, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent). In this he discusses his notion of 'political protest' (the war discussed briefly in 'The Political Equivalents of War'—*Christian Defense*, 103 *International Christianity* (November 1963)).
18. Sharp, 'The Meanings of Nonviolence', 44-45.
19. George R. Lakoff, 'The Sociological Mechanisms of Nonviolent Action', 3 *Peace Research Review* (December 1966) particularly 12-15.

22. For an earlier discussion of non-violent coercion, see Clarence Mordaunt, *Non-violent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure* (New York: The Century Company, 1911).

23. For a discussion of the relationship of the literature on affluence change to non-violent action, see Sidney J. Pollan, David S. Olson and David L. Yaffe, 'The Effect of Nonviolent Action on Social Attitudes', in *Sociological Inquiry* (Winter 1964) 21-31.

24. See Joan V. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963) 44-52.

25. For a discussion related to this, see Richard Gregg's discussion of moral psychology in *The Power of Nonviolence* (Hemel Hempstead: Palladium Publications, 1959) 42-51.

26. This account is derived entirely from newspapers and periodicals, including the *London Times*, the [Manchester] *Guardian*, the *New York Times*, *Newswatch*, the *Evening Standard*, the *Illustrated London News*, and *Peace News*. For this, as for the other events studied, a search was made to discover what, if anything, the military was trying about the protests. The result of this search was pretty interesting. Nothing at all could be found about the Panama action or Project COW (nothing may have appeared in base newspapers but these were not available). *Armed Forces Journal* carried extensive coverage of the issues involved, largely devoid of the Navy's position. 'Our interests are with the United States Navy, but not about Cuba', it says. Our bases, our opinions have shifted from the Navy's side to the Cubans as we worked down and checked out the story on these pages.' (25 May 1970, 22). However *AFL* did not even mention the protest activities. The *Polaris* action produced a small amount of coverage. *Starline* and *Rockline* mentioned the direct action protest when the crew first acted, and presented some of the objections and the Navy's response (24 November 1968, 12, and 21 November 1968, 12). The *Age of the Force Quarterly* carried an essay by Dr B. Hester (vol. 1, Winter 1969, 101-114) which discussed the mass protests over the *Polaris*. Hester defended the right of the protesters but questioned the 'reasoning' and success of the tactic of mass demonstrations.

The only article I found which dealt directly with official military policy regarding protests appeared in *Air Force Times* (12 October 1968). Base commanders were given advice about handling Vietnam protests, the emphasis was on base security, and local commanders were told to 'provide for increased armed forces police contingents at base entrance'. Other articles appeared which reflected military feelings (though not necessarily military policy) towards Vietnam protesters (cf. William Leavitt, 'The Vietnam-A Commentary', 48 *Air Force and Space Digest* (December 1968) 6-8). Generally, these articles defended in principle the right of protest and dissent but indicated contempt or pity (they 'are suspended' or 'detained') for those involved.

27. For a description of CHD, see Christopher Dennis, *The Swastika* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964). The leadership of CHD included many prominent figures: the best known of whom was Bernard Russell.

28. *London Times*, 22 February 1961, 15.

29. *London Times*, 3 March 1961, 3.

30. The *Evening Standard* reported that the Americans had mounted a 'quasi, white, and delinquent public relations operation . . . Nothing that Mr. Emyr Hughes and his drenched Glamorgan marchers did or did not. Saturday has been quite as effective as the publicity stunts of the Protest crew men-at-arms with the battered, Clyde-belt motifs of Argentina.' 11 March 1961, 364.

31. In Edinburgh, fourteen marchers were arrested for failing to follow the approved route. They were freed and released.

32. *London Times*, 26 May 1961, 6.

33. These efforts to clear a path resulted in complaints of 'rudely rough handling'.

However, DAC announced a few days later that it did not intend to lodge formal complaints, stating 'the Committee fully recognizes that if direct action of this sort is entered into, the demonstrators are always liable to have violence used against them in the name of order'. *London Times*, 25 May 1961, 4.

34. *The Economist*, 27 May 1961, 874.

35. *The [Blackburn] Guardian*, 13 May 1961, 16.

36. Of the four cases examined, the least information was available for the protest in Panama and it came chiefly from the organization sponsoring the protest. Those sources are Charles C. Walker, 'Protest in Panama Canal Zone: A Background Statement', (Philadelphia: A Quaker Action Group, n.d.) and AQAG, *Evolution in Latin America* (Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1970) 44-54.

37. AQAG, *Evolution in Latin America*, 44.

38. *Ibid.*, 54.

39. Material for this section is drawn from two sources, Susan Richards, 'Project CIBW: A Case Study of a Nonviolent Direct Action Campaign', (Haverford College Centre for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution, NYA Project, Report No. 31, June 1971), and Sidney I. Waldman, 'An Exchange Analysis of Project CIBW: A Case Study of a Nonviolent Direct Action Campaign', (Haverford College Centre for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution, NYA Project, Report No. 34, August 1971). See also, Waldman's paper, 'An Exchange Theory of Politics', presented at meeting of American Political Science Association, New York City, September 1969.

40. See the 'call', 'A Call for Nonviolent Action Against Chemical-Biological Warfare', *A Quaker Action Group Newsletter* 34 (May 1969).

41. One guerrilla (name sketch used by the group in Philadelphia was described in a news release in the following way: 'An Vietnamese peasant gather in Rottenhouse Square to plant rice, they and their crops are sprayed with herbicides. The peasants accuse the poisoners chemicals while a group of Americans amongst them their backs to the dying people'. Richards, 'Project CIBW', 4.

42. *Ibid.*, 16.

43. *Ibid.*, 20.

44. *Ibid.*, 23.

45. *Ibid.*, 24.

46. Some of those who had been arrested had heard Gb considering about having to work overtime. By taking the weekend off, the protestors could ease some of the discomfort which might have existed between them and have protested.

47. Reportedly, this compromise was pushed by a local newspaper who had been covering the protests and had access to senior base officials.

48. Richards, 'Project CIBW', 31.

49. *A Quaker Action Group Newsletter* 35 (November 1970).

50. This account of events in Cuba is drawn primarily from Charles C. Walker, 'On Cuba: Nonviolent Action and the U.S. Navy', 13 *Good Will* (October 1971, 284-293), and a long series of articles in *Armed Forces Journal* (between 23 May 1970 and 19 April 1971). Other sources include the *New York Times*, the *San Juan Star*, *Lit* (10 April 1970), *Nation* (10 August 1970), and *Christian Century* (4 January, 17 and 24 February, and 3 March 1971).

51. Quoted in *Armed Forces Journal*, 23 May 1970, 39.

52. *Ibid.*

53. These hearings were covered extensively by *Armed Forces Journal*.

54. PIP, led by Eugene Dennis, is committed to a program of 'peaceful defiance' (nonviolent action).

55. Walker, 'On Cuba', 285, the page number referenced refers to a reprint and not to the original journal page.

36. It is interesting to note that the one military publication that covered the affair, *Armed Forces Journal*, reported the Congressional action and the peace treaty, but ignored the protest demonstrations completely.

37. Walker, 'On Colombia', 328.

38. Quoted in *ibid.*, 328.

39. *Philadelphia Thursday's Drummer*, 12 February 1971, 4. Quoted in Walker, 'On Colombia', 329.

40. By now an opposition group had appeared among the Colombians, 'calling itself, Sons of Colombia. They marched under the banner of an American flag, demanding that "insurgency" leave, and called for peace and inequality'. Walker, 'On Colombia', 331.

41. Quoted in *ibid.*, 331.

42. The 12 January 1971 *New York Times* ran a follow-up article on Colombia that was about nine months after the announcement of the Navy's plans to leave the island. The *Times* reported that the Navy had ceased using five summarizing and had sharply curtailed the extent of shelling on Colombia. At the same time, rock squatters from the main island of Puerto Rico had built a number of week end homes on unused Navy property. Charles Walker reports (in a personal communication), after a visit to Colombia in February 1971, that 'apparently the Pentagon is still hopeful of holding on to Colombia. There are reports that private Pentagonians fear that if "they get away with it there" others in Latin America may also try to oust the Navy or other aspects of American military power. . . . Secretary [of Defense] Laird announced that they would conduct a poll of Colombians later in 1971 . . . . Apparently, the Navy hopes that the 64 jobs that they have created for Colombians (most paying as much as \$10,000 a year according to the *New York Times*) will have their impact and the people will vote their pocket books. There are those who say on Colombia that if they vote for the Navy and the Navy goes, that would not necessarily lose their jobs, because then the Navy would not need those jobs'.

There are additional indications that the Navy may not leave Colombia after all. Contrary to the Administration's pledge last year, the United States may continue to use and/or practice bombardments on and around Colombia, the tiny island off the coast of Puerto Rico. An internal White House memorandum from Mr. Gen. Alexander M. Haig, presidential assistant for external security affairs, has raised the question whether the island should not in fact be continued as a test to place for U.S. weapons.' *Fellowship*, November 1971, 38, 2.

43. The gandhian movement in India achieved some success with this kind of non-violent protest. Lately, the protest to leave the most success with this was the 1967 Pentagon protest, and it was not sustained.

44. Waldman, 'An Embattled Analysis of Puerto CWR', 3.

45. A sustained protest might have launched protests throughout Latin America as AQAC had hoped the Panama action would.

46. In some political systems, there may be no group, comparable to the American Congress, which is capable of bargaining with the military, in other systems, such as Britain, only the party in power may have this ability. There is one way in which the public might be able to bargain directly with the military. This would be to deny the military a supply of willing soldiers. This can be complicated through conscription laws (though one can also refuse induction). Unfortunately, to be effective, this must be a very long term process and require substantial effort and resources, a group engaged in protest with the military as a direct target would probably be unable to do this.

# *The anatomy of Gandhi's satyagraha*

---

RAM RATTAN

GANDHI IS ESSENTIALLY A PHILOSOPHER OF the politics of peaceful protest. He focuses attention on the narrower aspect of the individual's resistance to constituted authority and relates it not only to the wider context of his political life, but also to his nature as a moral being, striving to realize his divine self through the service of humanity. His basic dilemma is: how should a law-breaking citizen, or a group thereof, resist constituted authority, once he finds himself impelled to do so? He provides a definite guide to the means whereby conflict, especially political, can be resolved effectively and peacefully. And in his preoccupation with the means of conflict-resolution, he reverses Machiavelli's proposition that 'the end justifies the means'.<sup>1</sup> Gandhi's position is the means justify the end; noble ends demand noble means.<sup>2</sup>

Gandhi seeks an alternative to the way of violence (both in its organized and unorganized forms) which, he thinks, has failed, through the whole course of human history, to provide a lasting solution to human conflicts, political, social or economic.<sup>3</sup> He is convinced that fighting violence with violence only aggravates violence, fighting evil with evil multiplies evil. Violence is to be fought with its opposite, non-violence, evil with good.<sup>4</sup> The alternative that Gandhi offers says an emphatic 'No' to violence. His war is a 'war without violence', to use K. L. Shridharan's eloquent phrase.<sup>5</sup>

Gandhi's mode of conflict-resolution by peaceful means does not, however, imply passivity, weakness, helplessness or expediency.<sup>6</sup> It stands for the greatest courage man is capable of. It is a weapon of the morally vigilant and the active.<sup>7</sup> As Simone Porter-Brock puts it, Gandhi says 'No' to violence but 'Yes' to fighting.<sup>8</sup> Gandhi's mode is characterized by force, action and effectiveness.



# Meaning of satyagraha

The moral weapon to fight untruth with truth and violence with nonviolence is described by Gandhi as satyagraha. In *Indian Opinion*, he describes satyagraha as 'firmness in a good cause'.<sup>8</sup> In *Young India*, he points out that satyagraha is just a new name for the law of self-suffering.<sup>9</sup> And in *First Step*, he proclaims that 'Sacrifice of self is infinitely superior to sacrifice of others' and that a self-sufferer does not make others suffer for his mistakes.<sup>10</sup> Self-suffering brings the desired relief quickly and with greater certainty than does the imposition of suffering on the opponents.<sup>11</sup>

When we put together Gandhi's statements on the varied dimensions of satyagraha, we find that he conceives it as essentially an attitude of mind and a way of life based on the firm desire for vindicating just causes, correcting wrongs and converting wrong-doers by voluntary self-suffering and by patient and active use of the means which are nonviolent and intrinsically just.<sup>12</sup> James Luther Adams elaborates the meaning of Gandhi's satyagraha by describing it as '(1) a nonviolent, (2) public violation, (3) of a specific law or of laws, or of a policy of government having the effect of law, (4) which expresses a sense of justice in a civil society of cooperation among equals, and (5) which is generally undertaken in the name of presumed higher authority than the law in question, (6) as a last resort, (7) for the purpose of changing a law and (8) with the intention of accepting the penalty which the law imposes'.<sup>13</sup> Gandhi's satyagraha, thus, harmonises the cause, the end and the means.<sup>14</sup>

Joan V. Bondarant clearly distinguishes Gandhi's satyagraha from its obverse, dargraha.<sup>15</sup> She discovers that, in contradistinction to the former, the latter means stubborn resistance of the opponent's policy or action, 'prejudged' to be ipso-facto wrong. The dargraha regards truth, justice, rightness as monopoly and does not allow the possibility of the opponent also being in the right.

In dargraha, the opponent is regarded as the embodiment of evil. He is, therefore, blackmailed, harassed and humiliated. He is not allowed to explain his standpoint. Even the distinction between the wrong and the wrong-doer is not maintained. The dargrahi first destroys his opponent's position in order to destroy his mankind. The latter is subjected to maximum suffering. As a matter of fact, there is no meeting ground between the dargrahi and his adversary. The former forces the latter to accept defeat and to grant the desired concessions. The satyagrahi, on the other hand, enables the alleged evil-doer to prove his point and allows a fair chance of its acceptance.

*Purpose of satyagraha*

The social and political wrongs for the correction of which Gandhi employed and evolved the method and technique of satyagraha, during his five-decade-long public career, is an illustration of the wide range of objectives which can be attained without necessarily having recourse to violence. Gandhi's satyagraha points to two related things. Negatively, it enjoins upon man the duty to eradicate evil and, positively, it reminds him of his obligation to serve the community.

In fact, satyagraha amounts to the assertion of a moral right which the state law should recognise but which it denies.<sup>17</sup> It is to make up for the deficiencies of the law, and not for the defence of law itself, that a law-abiding citizen may resort to satyagraha. In other words, it is a way which the law-abiding citizens can adopt for seeking redress of their grievances and for solving conflicts and deadlocks on a durable basis.<sup>18</sup> As such, satyagraha is a para-legal method of registering peaceful protest against the laws, customs and practices which one finds contrary to the dictates of one's conscience.

In South Africa, Gandhi used satyagraha against the apartheid policy of the government.<sup>19</sup> In India, he offered it for seeking redress of particular grievances, and for the wider purpose of attaining India's independence.<sup>20</sup> His recurrent satyagraha movements proved that satyagraha can be used for the vindication of a just, clear, unequivocal and impersonal public cause or issue.<sup>21</sup> It can also be employed as an instrument of self-education and self-perfection.<sup>22</sup> Commenting on the nature of Gandhi's satyagraha movements, Henry Prosch rightly points out that Gandhi's satyagraha was "an available and sometimes effective means for securing desired social changes".<sup>23</sup>

Gandhi's satyagraha clearly distinguishes between the action and its author, the deed and the doer.<sup>24</sup> It shifts the emphasis from the doer to the deed so that both the satyagrahi and his opponent may address themselves to the solution of the problem rather than seek destruction of each other. Gandhi aims at the destruction of the evil act through the destruction of the evil-deed, but by changing his mentality so that he is enabled to appreciate righteousness. Like Tolstoy, he hates the sin but not the sinner. In *Harjila*, he observes: "The idea underlying satyagraha is to convert the wrong-doer, to awaken the sense of justice in him, to show him also that without the cooperation, direct or indirect, of the wronged, the wrong-deed cannot do the wrong intended by him."

In satyagraha, the opponent is not an enemy to be destroyed or defeated. He is a person who is to coexist with the satyagrahi. He is, therefore, to be helped to become a better man for himself and for society.<sup>25</sup> The satyagrahi is, therefore, obligated to enter into reason and

discussion with his opponent in order to awaken the sense of justice and fairness in him.<sup>11</sup> Should he fail in reason and discussion with his opponent, then he is to undergo self-suffering instead of inflicting suffering on the latter. The satyagrahi is to be ready to give up his life rather than take the opponent's life.<sup>12</sup> Voluntary self-suffering evokes the sense of justice in the wrong-doer by enabling him to reconsider his position vis-à-vis that of the satyagrahi. The satyagrahi's efforts ultimately lead to the discovery of an alternative which is acceptable to both him and his opponent. This is what Gandhi, probably, means by the phrase 'conversion of the wrong-doer'.<sup>13</sup> Discovery of the mutually acceptable alternative helps the enemy to become other than an enemy — a friend. To quote Thomas Merton, satyagraha seeks to change 'relationships that are evil into others that are good, or at least less bad'.<sup>14</sup>

Satyagraha also invariably exerts purifying influence on those in whose behalf it is undertaken.<sup>15</sup> It transforms the civil-resisters, emotions there. Gandhi's satyagraha movements proved that even the dumb and the illiterate participants become politically conscious and acquire a better sense of distinction between justice and injustice, right and wrong. Satyagraha and their followers find initiative and opportunity for participation in the social and political life of the nation. The South African satyagraha, for instance, enabled the so-called coolies and gave them self-confidence and self-reliance.<sup>16</sup> On its conclusion, Gandhi himself was a transformed person. To quote G. Barmachandran<sup>17</sup> 'Deep within him (Gandhi) were stored the first awareness of a great mission and we witness the rebirth of the man Gandhi into Gandhi the Mahatma. Mahatma literally means the great soul. That was an apt title which Dr Annie Besant and poet Rabindranath Tagore combined to confer on the transformed man from South Africa.' By precept and example, Gandhi proves that satyagraha can tear tyranny and injustice to pieces and yet 'redeem like the tyrant and his victim'.<sup>18</sup>

Satyagraha also quickens the conscience of the on-lookers and enables them to understand the respective positions of the conflicting parties. It helps them to take a decision based on the proper understanding of the merits and demerits of the claims of the conflicting parties. Proper understanding of the claims of conflicting parties by the on-lookers facilitates an early and intelligent resolution of the conflict. Satyagraha is thus a process of conflict-resolution by mutual understanding and by educating public opinion through reason, discussion and self-suffering.<sup>19</sup> It aims at the cleansing of the whole atmosphere and voluntary change of heart and mentality of all the parties to a conflict. To use Richard Gregg's oft-repeated phrase, satyagraha provides to all the parties to a conflict (the satyagrahi, the opponent and the on-lookers) a 'mirror' in which every person sees himself as others see him.<sup>20</sup>

*Range of satyagraha*

Gandhi's concept of satyagraha is comprehensive and universal. It can be employed by any man or woman who possesses the following qualifications or follows the leader who possesses them:<sup>47</sup> (a) he must be an actual sufferer or a bona fide inviter of the actual sufferers; (b) he must be a man of truth and nonviolence; (c) he must be a shatagrahi—a man of steady wisdom; (d) he must be a law-abiding citizen; (e) he must be vigilant, disciplined and trained for the job; (f) he must be a laboring khadi-wearer and spinner; (g) he must possess virtues like compassion and civility (internal and external) and abjure lust, anger, greed, infatuation, pride, and falsehood; (h) he must strive through reason, discussion and self-suffering to arrive at a solution which is agreeable to all; (i) he must allow his cards to be examined and re-examined at all times and make reparations if any error is discovered; and (j) he must refrain from taking illegitimate advantage of the opponent's weak point, or any step not warranted by the principles and circumstances of satyagraha.

Gandhi desires every person adopting satyagraha, as a way of life or as a weapon for fighting injustice, to possess all these and similar qualifications. However, he does not debar others from participating, directly or indirectly, in various satyagraha activities so long as there is an expert to supervise and guide continuously and vigilantly their men of integrity, character and discipline. Comparing the satyagrahi with a surgeon and the satyagraha-participants with his assistants, he says:<sup>48</sup> "Satyagraha is a purely spiritual weapon. It may be used . . . through men and women who do not understand it spiritually, provided the director knows that the weapon is spiritual. Everyone cannot use surgical instruments. Many use them, if there is an expert behind them directing their use. I claim to be a satyagraha expert in the making. I have need to be far more careful than the expert surgeon who is a complete master of his science. I am still a humble searcher."

Satyagraha can be practiced by a single individual or by a group. A minority can offer it against a majority and vice versa.<sup>49</sup> Most of Gandhi's satyagraha movements were collective, except his Individual Satyagraha of 1948-49 and the fasts that he undertook as many as seventeen times. The actual instances of satyagraha offered by Gandhi indicate that he was modern enough to recognize the importance of numbers in a struggle like that of satyagraha. The number of people involved by him in India's struggle for freedom remains unprecedented.

Michael Walzer also subscribes to the same view. He points out that desobedience when it is not criminality, but morally, religiously, politically motivated, is almost always a collective act. It is justified by the values of the collectivity and the mutual engagement of its members. He is of the considered view that the right to disobey "is not a right often

claimed or acted upon by individuals throughout history; when men have disobeyed or rebelled they have done so, by and large, as members or representatives of groups, and they have claimed, not merely that they are free to disobey but that they are obliged to do so.<sup>38</sup>

About the persons or agencies against whom satyagraha can be employed Gandhi has an open mind. He is of the view that satyagraha can be directed against any person or body of persons including the ones who are nearest and dearest to the prospective satyagrahi.<sup>39</sup> In the latter case, satyagraha is of greater advantage to the satyagrahi, as the adversary is likely to be more eager to arrive at an agreement than lose a relation, friend or neighbour.

Satyagraha can be practised not only against the government but also against society as a whole, as the latter may happen to be as wrong as the former.<sup>40</sup> Looking at the fairly long list of Gandhi's satyagraha adversaries, we find that as many as nineteen of his satyagraha movements were directed against various governmental agencies.<sup>41</sup> The Champaran satyagraha was directed against the British indigo planters,<sup>42</sup> whereas the opponents in the Ahmedabad satyagraha were the mill-owners with whom Gandhi had very friendly and cordial relations.<sup>43</sup> The object of his postcardal fasts were the wrong statutes of his satyagraha,<sup>44</sup> of his anti-violence fasts the anarchists,<sup>45</sup> and of his Hindu-Muslim unity fasts the communal fanatics.<sup>46</sup>

There is, however, a serious exception to the rule that satyagraha can be offered against any person. On the basis of his satyagraha experiments he says that satyagraha can be offered only in respect of the person or agency whose cause and means appear to be prima facie wrong. He does not visualise the possibility of the opponent also being a satyagrahi, probably because he did not come across a satyagrahi amongst his opponents. Consequently he regards counter-satyagraha to be an impossibility.<sup>47</sup>

Gandhi's satyagraha can be offered only on impersonal issues, for selfishness and satyagraha can never go together. He requires the satyagrahi to offer satyagraha in the spirit of promoting a common cause, without even being conscious of their selfish interests.<sup>48</sup>

It can, moreover, be employed only in those situations in which the satyagrahi is required to act positively. Gandhi explains this point thus:<sup>49</sup> 'It must also be realised that there are evils to which satyagraha cannot be applied . . . For instance, if the government does not allow us to acquire land, satyagraha will be of no avail. If, however, it forbids us from walking along a certain footpath or asks us to shift to locations, or seeks to prevent us from carrying on trade, we can resort to satyagraha. That is, if we are required to do anything which violates our religion or insults our manhood, we can administer the inviolable physics of satyagraha.'

Simone Pinner-Brick confirms that is Gandhi's satyagraha struggles, 'Action always followed the provocation of the government'.<sup>10</sup> Gandhi's decision to undertake satyagraha was every time justified by the opponent's offensive. Thus, in South Africa, the justification of the fight in the Transvaal was the Black Act, that of the violation of the Natal Transvaal Statute was the Immigrant's Act connected with the Black Act, that of excluding women was the Government's refusal to legitimate certain marriages; while that of the general strike was to keep the promise Gandhi had given to Gokhale to seek abolition of the £3 Tax on re-indentured labourers.<sup>11</sup>

Satyagraha was conceived by Gandhi in an abnormal situation. It was born in South Africa in the context of extreme racism and was nurtured in India in that of alien rule. He employed it during his five-decade-long public life as an antithesis to racism, imperialism and various other forms of tyranny. He justified its validity under these abnormal situations on the ground that the democratic methods of agitation were not open to the people for fighting these instances of injustice. Racism and imperialism do not stand for truth and justice. Satyagraha is, therefore, a legitimate alternative for fighting injustice under these regimes.

Otherwise, democracy stands for truth and justice; it implies self-government and good government and ensures to the people the right to challenge and even change the government. Satyagraha too stands for truth and justice and enables the people to challenge and change any government which is inefficient, incompetent, tyrannical or unjust. The aims of democracy and satyagraha being the same, should the conscientious objectors be allowed to violate laws even under democracy? If so, how often? These questions have bothered, and even shocked, the conscience of the people in the post-Gandhi era.

In reply to such questions, it may be said that satyagraha is not conceived nor can it be used as an antithesis to democracy. Nor, again, can it be treated as a substitute for the institutional framework of democracy, since it is only a mode of fighting injustice and not a means of instituting a government. Even as it is, it relies more on individual leaders than on governmental institutions. And there too it imposes exceptional burdens on the satyagrahi and demands unusual moral courage on his part. Gandhi's own record as a satyagrahi is deeply impressive. In fact, it seems that Gandhi's conception of an ideal satyagrahi is a description of himself. One such person was enough for involving the whole nation in its fight for freedom. But, in democracy, as Morris-Jones puts it, it may still be wise to expect less of individual leaders and rely more on the institutional framework.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, however, is not to deny satyagraha a place in parliamentary democracy whose laws do, ordinarily, enjoy the confidence and accep-

tance of the majority Parliamentary democracy, after all, is no perfect system of government. It has its own weaknesses and drawbacks. A constitutional objector may not always find the constitutional method of agitation sufficient. Satyagraha, in such a situation, should be resorted to only if and when constitutionalism finally fails the individual's aspirations. Except that it must be used sparingly and with utmost caution so that it does not result in violence or loss of people's respect for the duly constituted authority or its laws. This caution is essential despite the fact that the civil-disobedient's voluntary acceptance of punishment enhances, rather than erodes, people's respect for law. The very purpose of satyagraha is to substitute willing obedience for forced obedience and voluntary cooperation for involuntary cooperation. It is not aimed at replacing democracy with anarchy, although such would ultimately be the case if the former is not properly used. Thus as a supplement to constitutionalism and not as its antithesis or substitute, satyagraha has a definite place in democracy too.

### *Satyagraha preconditions*

Satyagraha was conceived by Gandhi as an alternative to violence and cowardice and not to constitutionalism. A satyagrahi must, therefore, exhaust the constitutional means available to him before launching on direct satyagraha action. To exhaust constitutional means of redress, before causing an infringement of law, is a rule of prudence as well as of justice. It is a avowal of democracy. Through precept and example, Gandhi thus suggests that the following constitutional devices be exhausted before having recourse to satyagraha.

**WAIT AND WATCH:** Gandhi believes that 'patience and perseverance overcome mountains'.<sup>11</sup> His basic conviction is that everything comes right for those who wait, walk and pray.<sup>12</sup>

**ASSEMBLING OF FACTS BY PUBLIC INQUIRY:** A prudent satyagrahi must ascertain the full facts of a case before launching on direct action. He should examine, sift, collate and analyse the grievances of the group on whose behalf the satyagraha is to be offered. He should also take into account the merits and demerits of the opponent's case. It was for the correct ascertainment of the whole situation that Gandhi made use of this method on five of his collective satyagraha movements, namely, the Viramgam Question (1913), Champaran Satyagraha (1917), the Kheda Satyagraha (1917), the First Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement (1920), and the Rajkot Satyagraha (1933).<sup>13</sup>

**TOUR (INCLUDING WALKING-TOUR OR PADAYATRA):** Sometimes it may be necessary to tour the disturbed area in order quickly and effectively to check the spread of violence or communal animosity. A tour of the affected area enables the satyagrahi to establish mass contact and to educate or create public opinion in favour of peace and unity.

Gandhi frequently undertook tours for educating the masses about the evils of untouchability and communal frenzy.<sup>10</sup>

**NEGOTIATIONS.** No government serves without being asked, that is, governments do not undertake welfare measures of their own accord. People have to shout and strive in order to make their voices heard, to secure justice at the hands of an unimaginative, insensitive and unwilling administration. Gandhi was of the view that a constant reminder to the authorities is a pre-condition of securing the desired results. Those who feel aggrieved should appeal to the good sense of the opponent and simultaneously evoke public opinion in favour of justice and tranquility. He employed this method in all his collective satyagraha movements and in those of his individual satyagrahis which related to questions of nationwide importance.<sup>11</sup> He made numerous petitions to the government and led a number of deputations to seek removal of vexatious disabilities against Indians. Behind all this was his conviction that negotiations, backed by the unreserved possibility or threat of satyagraha, enable both parties to give serious thought to the problem, which is the first requisite of an honourable settlement.<sup>12</sup>

**ARBITRATION.** Gandhi admits that differences, we shall always have. It is human. What is important is that we must learn to settle them all, whether religious or other, by arbitration.<sup>13</sup> It was during his Ahmedabad satyagraha of 1918 that Gandhi had recourse to this method.<sup>14</sup>

**PROMOTION OF COMMUNAL UNITY.** Having realised that under the British system of government one has to show some strength before expecting justice, he put a premium on the strength that comes from unity among the people. His belief in the effectiveness of communal unity is so intense that he puts Hindu-Muslim unity as a pre-condition for the attainment of *swaraj*.<sup>15</sup>

**FORMATION OF POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.** Realising the necessity and importance of the people's united efforts for the redress of grievances, Gandhi not only established the Moral India Congress (1894), the South-African British Indian Committee (1896) and the Satyagraha Sabha (1919), but also actively participated in the activities of the Gujarat Sabha through which he conducted his Kheda Satyagraha (1918) and the Indian National Congress through which he conducted five of his mass satyagraha movements for securing India's freedom from alien British rule.<sup>16</sup> Through the Satyagraha Sabha, he had raised a corps of satyagrahis with whose active assistance he conducted India's struggle for freedom.

**PEOPLE'S MEETINGS AND PROGRAMMES.** Gandhi is modern enough to recognise the importance of informing public opinion through the media of mass meetings and street processions. He thinks that an individual whose moral experience never reached beyond a monologue would know nothing at all about responsibility and would have none. Such a man



would have rights, including the right to rebel. His possession of the right to rebel would, however, be purely theoretical, he would never become a rebel. What is necessary is the clear understanding by the opponent of the essential points of the satyagrahi's cause and struggle. The better your opponent understands your condition and your cause the less likely is he to use violent means. The understanding of the merits and demerits of the claims of both the parties helps in the minimization of violence and the maximization of the possibility of an early solution agreeable to both the parties.<sup>41</sup> With all this in view, Gandhi organized innumerable protest meetings and led many big and small street processions in the course of his satyagraha struggles both in South Africa and India.

### *Satyagraha preparations*

On the conclusion of his Kheda Satyagraha (1918), Gandhi had realized that exhausting the available constitutional means is not enough for launching on direct satyagraha action. It is equally important to create a band of volunteers who would be permitted to offer satyagraha after they have undergone a sort of training in the use of nonviolent methods. They are to be educated about the deeper implications of satyagraha.<sup>42</sup> They are to be told about the attitude they should adopt towards the opposite party. They are to be told not only to abstain from the use of violence but also to stop the inadvertent occurrence of violence in any form and at any stage of satyagraha. All this necessitates a sort of regular education and training for all those persons who volunteer themselves for satyagraha. Gandhi thus recognizes the necessity of arranging training camps for the prospective satyagrahis. They are to be especially trained in the art of curbing levitations, controlling large crowds and restoring order.<sup>43</sup> It was with the active assistance of such trained and experienced volunteers that direct action was launched during the Salt Satyagraha of 1930.<sup>44</sup>

Gandhi also gives the satyagraha-pledge a definite place in his satyagraha primaries. He is of the view that the solemn declaration by the satyagrahis that they would peacefully resist injustice and cheerfully suffer the consequent hardships is enough to make the satyagraha action effective. He thinks that taking of vows is a sign of strength for it enables the satyagrahis to undergo greater suffering for the sake of the cause which they are pledged to secure.<sup>45</sup> It strengthens the satyagrahis' will-power and baffles them for the task they wish to embark on.<sup>46</sup> Gandhi's collective satyagraha movements always started with the participating volunteers solemnly and uniformly resolving (a) not to submit to injustice; (b) to refrain from violence to opponent's life, person and property; and (c) to cheerfully suffer the consequences.

Prayer to God for self-purification is also an integral part of Gandhi's

satyagraha preparedness. He believes that 'prayer from the heart can achieve what nothing else can in this world'.<sup>71</sup> He claims that prayer to be his greatest and mightiest weapon. He maintains that it is through prayer to God that the conscience of the opponent can be stirred to make him see the rightness of the claims of those who strive suffering for conscience's sake.<sup>72</sup> It was due to this inherent belief in the effectiveness and validity of prayer to God that Gandhi resorted to it before inaugurating his satyagraha movements, collective or individual.

The declaration and despatch of an ultimatum marks the dividing line between the constitutional and the satyagraha methods. The ultimatum is the satyagrahis' statement of minimum demands which the addressee is required to fulfil, within a specific time, and the non-fulfilment of which entails the threat of direct action. Gandhi had recourse to satyagraha only on the expiry, or the rejection, by his adversaries, of his ultimatums.<sup>73</sup>

### *Satyagraha methods*

Gandhi's main contribution to the theory of politics is his recommendation of a *modus operandi* for conscientious objections. In the course of his non-violent struggles in South Africa and India, he worked out a number of methods for seeking correction of wrongs and conversion of wrong-doers. The methods he recommends are not of universal application, for a set of them applies only to specific situations. Yet the following characteristics are common to these methods.

In the first place, the methods of satyagraha must be in full consonance with the ends to be achieved. An ardent opponent of Machiavellism, Gandhi propounds the theory that the means justify the end.<sup>74</sup> He is of the considered view that it is neither possible nor desirable to detach the end from the means employed for its attainment.<sup>75</sup> Neither can good come out of evil nor evil out of good. He likens the means to a seed and the end to a tree.<sup>76</sup> Hence his advice is that, while seeking correction of wrongs and conversion of wrong-doers, men should generally take care of the means and leave the end to God, with a fair chance of good resulting only in good.<sup>77</sup>

Gandhi is also an uncompromising opponent of violent methods to serve the noblest causes, for he thinks that 'permanent good can never be the outcome of untruth and violence'.<sup>78</sup> He denounces the methods of violence as being barbarous and, hence, inconsistent with the genius of man.<sup>79</sup>

Finally, he insists that the methods adopted for the correction of wrongs and conversion of wrong-doers must not merely be consistent and non-violent, these must also be in tune with time and circumstances.<sup>80</sup> He requires the satyagrahis to 'do as Romans do',<sup>81</sup> without decoupling the essential unity between the cause, the end and

the means

During his long public career extending over a period of more than half a century, Gandhi employed and recommended the following methods for offering satyagraha:

**BOYCOTT MEETINGS, DEMONSTRATIONS AND PROCESSIONS:** Holding of banned meetings, demonstrations and processions occupies a definite place in Gandhi's main satyagraha movements. These are organized not only to register protest against the misdeeds of the government but also to educate public opinion against injustice. Gandhi employed this method to condemn the various forms of apartheid and alien rule.<sup>51</sup> These were most prominent during Gandhi's Second Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement (1931) and the Quit India Movement (1942).<sup>52</sup>

**CEREMONIAL MARCH:** Undertaking a ceremonial march in defiance of prohibitory orders and thereby courting imprisonment is a very potent and drastic method of offering satyagraha. It also dramatizes the issue and attracts more and more people for resisting injustice and tyranny.<sup>53</sup> Gandhi adopted this method for the first time in the course of his South African satyagraha movement by leading a ceremonial march on 6 November 1913 from Chatsworth to Dander in Transvaal, without requiring permits.<sup>54</sup> The second occasion arose during the Salt Satyagraha of 1930, when he started his Dandi March from Sabarmati Ashram to Dandi on the sea coast on 12 March 1930.<sup>55</sup> During his Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement too Gandhi led a ceremonial march on 1 August 1933, from Sabarmati Ashram to Bas, in order to court imprisonment with the intention of 'sensitizing and commencing the Civil Disobedience Movement'.<sup>56</sup> He does used this method mainly to evoke among the masses a sense of arrest, a sense of disorientation, against the alien British rule in India.

**NATIONAL 'DAYS' AND 'WEEKS':** Observing of National 'Days' and 'Weeks' is to record the nation's protest against the acts of terror, to seek redress of public grievances and to urge the government to fulfil its promises. These are also observed by the satyagrahis for their own purification and for the renewal of their satyagraha pledge. The underlying object is to reanimate the mass consciousness and to consolidate public cooperation. Some of these 'Days' were the Satyagraha Day (1931),<sup>57</sup> Khilafat Days (1919-1920),<sup>58</sup> Independence Day (1930),<sup>59</sup> Gandhi Day (1930), and the Flag Day, Motilal Day, Shotagar Day, Famine Day and Gorkhali Day during the Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement of 1931-1934.<sup>60</sup>

**PAMPHLETS AND NEWS-PAPERS:** Publication of pamphlets and newspapers is another important method of seeking redress of grievances, defying unwarranted restraints on the freedom of the press and challenging the government to support the civil resisters. This method is also employed for removing the causes of misunderstanding between

the rulers and the ruled, promoting communal amity, seeking the uplift of the backward classes, and mobilising public opinion to bring home the deeper implications of satyagraha. Gandhi's first pamphlet, popularly known as the 'Green Pamphlet' was entitled *The Grievances of The British Indians in South Africa—An Appeal to The Indian Public*.<sup>10</sup> This was followed by his famous booklet, *Hind Swaraj*.<sup>11</sup> In India, he issued seventeen leaflets during his Ahmedabad Satyagraha, one pamphlet and a manifesto during his Kheda Satyagraha, twenty-one leaflets during his Rowlett Act Satyagraha, a daily News Bulletin and a number of pamphlets during the Bardoli Satyagraha and two issues of Satyagraha during his Rowlett Act Satyagraha.<sup>12</sup> In addition to these occasional leaflets, pamphlets, booklets and bulletins, he edited and sponsored three English weeklies, namely, *Indian Opinion* (1903-1914), *Young India* (1918-1931) and *Harijan* (1933-1948).<sup>13</sup> He often brought out Hindi, Gujarati and Tamil editions of these week-papers.

**HARTAL:** Hartal means voluntary closure of shops and suspension of business, usually for a symbolic period of 24 hours.<sup>14</sup> It is an outward expression of the community's disapproval of unwarranted laws and arbitrary orders. It is also employed to lodge the people's protest against the arrest of satyagrahis and to boycott the visits of government officials. It provides occasions both for offering public prayers and observing a state of mourning, if necessary.<sup>15</sup> Gandhi applied this method for the first time during his South African satyagraha movement on 28 July 1907 as a demonstration of the extreme dissatisfaction of the Transvaal Indian businessmen with the Asiatic Registration Act.<sup>16</sup> On subsequent occasions, it was employed as and when its need arose during his satyagraha struggles.

**STRIKES:** The strike is labour's instrument for the acquisition of a desired standard of treatment and living from the employer.<sup>17</sup> It was specifically this object that prompted Gandhi during his Ahmedabad Satyagraha to address to the millworkers an oath on 26 February 1918 not to resume work till their grievances were redressed.<sup>18</sup>

Strikes may also be employed directly and openly to achieve political ends, as for seeking repeal of the £ 3 Tax in South Africa.<sup>19</sup> Gandhi is, however, against strikes in public-utility services like the railways, police, mail-services, post-offices, etc. A strike in such services puts the community, or at least a substantial section of it, to loss, harassment or inconvenience. Dislocation of these services endangers public life.<sup>20</sup>

**CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE:** Civil disobedience can be undertaken for the deliberate breach of certain nonmoral statutory enactments, or as the symbolic nonviolent revolt against the State. In either case, it does not reflect want of respect for the constituted authority.<sup>21</sup> Its ultimate aim is to substitute voluntary cooperation for involuntary cooperation and willing obedience for forced obedience. This underlying objective alone

can make the satyagrahis adhere to their inner voice.<sup>128</sup> Thus conceived, civil disobedience was offered by Gandhi and his co-workers in South Africa by refusing to submit to compulsory re-registrations, by boycotting and picketing the government offices, by refusing to give finger prints or thumb impressions, by travelling without licences or by declining to produce them when demanded, by trading without licences and by crossing into neighbouring provinces without registration certificates.<sup>129</sup> In India civil disobedience was offered by him and his co-satyagrahis by violating laws regarding publication of prohibited literature, by desalting salt from sea-water, by violating unjust codes of all sorts, and by cutting palm trees which were a source of revenue to the government.<sup>130</sup>

**NONVIOLENT NON-COOPERATION** The technique of nonviolent non-cooperation is an alternative to anarchy. It is conceived by Gandhi as a positive force as much as it means cooperation with all that is good.<sup>131</sup> Thus conceived, this method was used by him during his five mass satyagraha movements for securing India's independence from British rule.

Gandhi's nonviolent non-cooperation with the alien British Government was a total non-cooperation. The use of this method in respect of a democratic government would necessarily be limited, for self-government is essentially based on the principle of the consent of the majority. If a democratic government goes wrong, partial non-cooperation with it is permissible, as total non-cooperation would destroy the democratic institutions themselves. To quote Gandhi: 'Total nonviolent non-cooperation has, then, no place in popular Raj, whatever its level may be.'<sup>132</sup>

**NO-TAX CAMPAIGN.** The satyagrahis may try to cut the very life-line of the Government by refusing to pay taxes. All functions of the Government would stop the moment people withhold payment of taxes.<sup>133</sup> The entire administration would come to a standstill for want of finances. This extreme method should, however, be resorted to only when no other way is left open and the only choice is between complete annihilation and total reformation. It should never be employed in haste or for evoking a ready response amongst the people. The call for its adoption should be given to them only after they have been convinced of its full implications. Because once the people stop paying taxes, the Government uses its force to recover the same. The defaulters may or may not be sued in court. In either case, they may be put behind bars and their property confiscated. A no-tax campaign should, therefore, be launched only if and when the people have been psychologically prepared to undergo the sufferings and sacrifices which their refusal to pay the taxes may involve.

Gandhi asked the people not to pay taxes to the Government in the course of his Kheda Satyagraha (1918)<sup>134</sup> and the Karnataka Satyagraha (1931).<sup>135</sup> In the course of the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928),<sup>136</sup> the

Salt Satyagraha (1930)<sup>104</sup> and the Second Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement (1931)<sup>105</sup> also no-tax campaigns were launched. Finally, during the Individual Satyagraha (1940) Gandhi gave the call of '*na ak pat na ak khat*', as a protest against the British Government's action involving India in the Second World War without her consent.<sup>106</sup>

**COURTING IMPRISONMENT:** Having imprisonment by the deliberate breach of laws contrary to one's conscience as an effective mode of registering protest with the adversary.<sup>107</sup> Governments often accede even to the genuine demands of the people only under pressure.<sup>108</sup> And the purpose of non-payment of taxes is to bring economic and political pressure to bear on the Government. When people suffer for conscience's sake, their voluntary suffering creates a public opinion unfavourable to the misdeeds of the oppressor and often forces his hands to grant justice.<sup>109</sup>

The spectacle of numbers of people ready to suffer indignities, arrest, legal penalties and sometimes even physical injuries for the cause they have embarked upon also impresses the public in their favour. The public sees their dedication, their seriousness and the intensity of their devotion to the cause and is thus led to respect them. It counts on them and their wishes as the real power to be reckoned with. Accomplishing one's own arrest and punishment also keeps injury to the general public quite at a minimum. On the other hand, the non-use of violence by the satyagrahis against their adversary enables them to be true to their conscience, for they taste suffering without inflicting it upon the opponent.<sup>110</sup>

Courting imprisonment became a frequent occurrence during Gandhi's satyagraha movements. He not only advised his co-satyagrahis and others to adopt this method, he himself courted imprisonment four times during his South African satyagraha movement and six times in the course of his satyagraha campaigns in India, spending in various prisons a total period of 6 years, 4 months and 14 days.<sup>111</sup> As he admitted, he became almost a 'habitual prisoner'.<sup>112</sup> He said: 'I would far rather pass the whole of my lifetime in jail and be perfectly happy than see my fellow-countrymen subjected to indignity and I should come out of the jail.'<sup>113</sup> Everytime Gandhi went to an Indian jail, he wished to be released by a 'Swaraj Parliament',<sup>114</sup> but this was not his fate.

**BOYCOTT:** Boycott is a sort of punishment and is conceived in a vindictive spirit.<sup>115</sup> The object of the boycott of commodities, shops, persons and institutions is not only to lodge protest against but also to put pressure on the opposite party in order ultimately to seek redress of grievances. The idea is to revenge oneself against the adversary for the wrongs done by him. It is employed to 'bring about a breakdown of law and order' and thus to tell the lawbreakers that the satyagrahis would

not be a party to wrong-doing.<sup>127</sup> It also puts economic pressure on the opponent in order to force him to grant justice expeditiously. Thus conceived, this method was employed and experimented by Gandhi in different situations both in South Africa and India.

In South Africa, the satyagraha campaign was characterised by the boycott of permit offices, registration certificates and the local *Boer* shops arranged to welcome the Duke of Cornwall and subsequently to celebrate the coronation of King George V.<sup>128</sup> In India, the satyagraha campaign envisaged the complete boycott of foreign goods, institutions, honours and official functions.<sup>129</sup> In the course of the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928) the revenue collectors were also socially boycotted.<sup>130</sup> All these multifarious instances of boycott reveal Gandhi's sincere attempt to seek redress of grievances by exercising allround pressure on the government and to create political awakening and the *swadeshi* spirit amongst the Indian masses.

**PEACEFUL PICKETING:** The purpose of peaceful picketing is also to put socio-political-economic pressure on the government and awaken courage to create political consciousness and the *swadeshi* spirit amongst the masses. The picket's attitude even towards the alleged wrong-doers or 'black-legs' is essentially non-violent. The picket is only to dissuade them from doing the intended wrong. He is not to coerce, insult or intimidate them. His only weapon is his speech which, too, is to be used gently and unoffensively.<sup>131</sup> That is why Gandhi calls the pickets by the dignified names of watchmen and missionaries. The picket's duty is essentially to enter into argument with the wrong-doers, to entreat them and to beg of them. If in spite of this they wish to court 'slavery', they ought to have the freedom to do so, for it is our duty to extend to others the same freedom that we want for ourselves.<sup>132</sup>

As such, this method was employed by Gandhi for the first time during his South African satyagraha movement against the Asiatic Permit offices.<sup>133</sup> In India, it was employed during the First and Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movements mainly against the sale and use of foreign cloth and liquor shops.

**PEACEFUL RAIDS:** The method of peaceful raids is an advanced stage of boycott and peaceful picketing. The satyagraha adopting this method is vindictive and, in order to bring economic pressure and the pressure of public opinion on his opponent, does the maximum harm to the latter's goods, though not to his person. It is peaceful in the sense that no injury is done to the person of the opponent. In peaceful raids, the satyagrahis, in violation of law, deliberately indulge in the act of looting. They take away the goods despite the adversary's resistance, for they deem the lost to be a commodity meant for universal consumption and not for monopolisation or storage. During the Salt Satyagraha (1930), peaceful raids were made on various salt depots and the raiders took

away thousands of strands of salt under showers of lashes and bullets.<sup>120</sup>

**PROTEST DEMONSTRATION:** To resign from the Assembly or Council as a mark of protest against the official policy is another method which manifested itself during a number of satyagraha movements. Members and sympathisers of the Congress resigned from the Imperial Legislative Council, the Governor-General's Council, the Council of India and the Provincial Legislative Councils.<sup>121</sup>

**FASTING (IVEN TO DEATH):** Fasting is perhaps the greatest and the most effective weapon in the satyagraha armoury. It is to be undertaken either for self-purification or self-restraint or for appealing to the better nature of the opposite party in order to make him reconsider his stand and redress his wrong.<sup>122</sup> It may be undertaken to check acts of violence, to remove bitterness or even to purify the political atmosphere.<sup>123</sup> It, however, is to be employed only as 'a species of *tyaga*', and never as a method of compelling undue pressure on the opposite party.<sup>124</sup>

Fasting should, moreover, be undertaken only by an 'expert' and by him, too, only according to his capacity to fast.<sup>125</sup> It should be undertaken only on rare occasions, only as a last resort and only in obedience to the call of one's conscience.<sup>126</sup>

As such, fasting was undertaken by Gandhi on as many as sixteen occasions. Of these, three fasts were against official injustice, four against the practice of untouchability, three against Hindu-Muslim riots and four against other acts of violence. Further, three of his fasts were for self-purification and penance, one to encourage the Ahmedabad mill workers in the strike, which they were quitting on his advice, in order to secure an increase in their wages. In terms of duration, on seven occasions he undertook fasts to death, on three occasions for twenty-one days, on another three for seven days and on one occasion each for one day, three days five days and fourteen days respectively, fasting thus for a total period of 138 days.<sup>127</sup>

**NON-POSSESSION:** The strategy of non-possession or voluntary renunciation of property is employed to urge upon the government that it cannot force the people to cooperate with it or obey its commands against their will. It is to convert that the government does not forcibly realize its dues by seizure and confiscation of the defaulter's property or possessions. The strategy is to declare one's property (by dedicating it for public purpose, debanding it, or selling or donating it to someone who is not a defaulter) in anticipation of its seizure and confiscation by the government.<sup>128</sup> This method was employed by Gandhi during the Bardoli Satyagraha (1928), the Salt Satyagraha (1930), and the Second Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement (1932).

**CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM:** The purpose of the constructive program is to achieve economic self-sufficiency and inculcate the *swadishi* spirit amongst the masses. It can be employed also for the promotion of con-



racial harmony and the removal of social evils like untouchability, unemployment and illiteracy. As a species of total non-cooperation with the British rule in India, it was employed also to replace governmental institutions with voluntary public (national) institutions.<sup>124</sup>

The constructive program as a method of satyagraha was adopted by Gandhi during his First Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement (1930), the Bardoli Satyagraha (1931), the Salt Satyagraha (1930) and the Individual Satyagraha (1940). However, as a definite method of achieving complete independence, the constructive program found its clear and full exposition only in the post-Individual Satyagraha period of December 1941. It was during this period that Gandhi expounded his whole philosophy of the constructive program and published it in a 25-page booklet entitled *Constructive Program*.<sup>125</sup>

It is through the advocacy and use of these methods that Gandhi delivered his supreme message of substituting willing obedience for forced obedience, and voluntary cooperation for forced cooperation. It is this message that has vouchsafed for Gandhi his unique position in the galaxy of philosophers and reformers. Commenting on Gandhi's philosophy and technique of peaceful protest through satyagraha, Disenker observes: "It is not Gandhi who made satyagraha but satyagraha which has made Gandhi; . . . if it is a matter of obligation between the two, it is satyagraha which has obliged Gandhi [i] rather than the reverse."<sup>126</sup>

### Conclusion

In the post-Gandhi era of Indian politics, Gandhi's satyagraha techniques have been identified with practically every form of protest, especially with strikes and boycotts, fasts and threats of self-immolation, dharna and pen-down campaigns, and bandhs and gliters. These forms of protest involve 'pre-judgment', and consequently 'symbolic violence', and are, therefore, a species of *daragraha*, the antithesis of satyagraha. Failure to grasp the spirit of satyagraha has resulted in people's loss of faith in it as a supplement to democracy. To restore their faith in Gandhi's whole philosophy of peaceful protest, the people need to be properly educated and trained before their leaders give them the satyagraha call. Gandhi had employed satyagraha techniques in the two contexts of apartheid and alien rule. Both were abhorrent situations. In the context of parliamentary democracy, Gandhi's satyagraha techniques need to be interpreted so as to ensure that by their inevitable use the spirit and institutions of democracy are properly developed and refined, not destroyed. This can be done with benefit, as demonstrated in the case of Martin Luther King's movement against racial discrimination—the predominantly nonviolent campaign which has established the living influence and the extent of practicability of Gandhi's ideal and technique of satyagraha.

1. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. by Luigi Ricci, Rev. and E.R.P. Vincent (Bombay: Indo Publishing House, 1937) ch. XVIII 31.
2. M.K. Gandhi, *An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, trans. by Mahadevi Desai (2d Edn., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1934) 200; *Varjjan* (Ahmedabad): 14-10-1937, 361-362, 4-10-1946, 341, and 22-6-1947, 200.
3. *Varjjan*, 3-4-1939, 260, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi—CWMO* (Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Government of India) 2 362, CWMO, 12 249.
4. CWMO, 9 133. See also, James Luther Adams, 'Civil Disobedience: Its Concepts And Limits', in *Political and Legal Obligations*, ed. by J.R. Pennock and J.W. Chapman (Newark 218, New York: Atherton Press, 1970) 31.
5. K.L. Shrivastava, *The Ethical Values: A Study of Gandhi's Method And Its Accomplishments* (1 Edn., London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1939) 11-12. For Gandhi's statement see, M.K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha in South Africa*, trans. by V.G. Deras (1 Edn., Madras: S. Ganesan, 1931) 173.
6. CWMO, 8 131, CWMO, 12 13. and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 3, 173-74.
7. *Ibid.*, 171-68.
8. Simone Foster-Buck, *Gandhi Against Machiavellism*, trans. by P. Leco (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1956) 1, 221-36.
9. CWMO, 4 22-23.
10. CWMO, 18 113, CWMO, 18 303, and CWMO, 4 161.
11. CWMO, 9 14-23, 118, CWMO, 12, 30-31, and M.K. Gandhi, *Hand Sewing or Indian Home Rule* (11 Edn., 188 Imp., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1936) 79.
12. *Varjjan*, 9 7-1938, 171, and CWMO, 10 184.
13. CWMO, 1 43, CWMO, 3 315, CWMO, 4 160, CWMO, 4 23-23, 31, 131, 151; CWMO, 9 23, 30-31, 402. CWMO, 10 348. CWMO, 11 40-41; *Varjjan*, 5-3-1938, 173, 10-12-1938, 349, 11-3-1939, 14, 30-4-1946, 334 and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 3, 173.
14. James Luther Adams, op. cit. 284.
15. Simone Foster-Buck, op. cit., 225-28.
16. Jean V. Bordarieu, 'Satyagraha Versus Durgartha', *Gandhi: His Achievements For Our Times*, ed. by G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan (1 Edn., Bombay: Bharatya Vidya Bhavan, 1960) 67-81. See also CWMO, 19 363, for Gandhi's views on durgartha. See also S.G. Bhaze, 'Satyagraha And Democracy', *Gandhi Marg*, V 1, No. 4, 283-290.
17. D.G. Tandelkar, *Mahatma: Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi* (1 Edn., Bombay: V.K. Narayan and D.G. Tandelkar, 1937) 91, 16. See also, W.S. Mahon, 'Impact of Nonviolence on the American Negro', *Gandhi Marg*, V 13, No. 4, 284.
18. *Varjjan*, 9-6-1933, 4; 10-6-1946, 204, 20-7-1947, 248. See also CWMO, 7 111, CWMO 9 36-37, and Pyralis, *Gandhi's Correspondence With the Government 1947-49* (11 Edn., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1949) 41. For confirmation of Gandhi's views, see also, Gena Sharp, 'Gandhi's Defense Policy', *Gandhi Marg*, V, No. 3, 189-91, Harry French, 'Towards An Ethics of Civil Disobedience', *Editor* (Chicago) V, LXXVII, No. 3, 175, and James Luther Adams, op. cit., 365-394.
19. CWMO, 12 264-68, 483.
20. Ram Narain, *Gandhi's Concept of Political Obligations* (1 Edn., Calcutta: The Mahatma Association, 1972) 177, n. 40.
21. *Varjjan*, 10-3-1946, 134 and 9-7-1934, 173. See also, Aditya Aditya, 'The Place of Satyagraha in Democracy', *A L.C.C. Research Review* (New Delhi) V IX, No. 23, 15-18.

22. *Harjan*, 6-7-1917, 112, and CWMG, 19-202.
23. Henry Ponsch, *op. cit.*, 176.
24. Ram Ratan, *op. cit.*, 111-16.
25. *Harjan*, 10-12-1938, 269.
26. R. R. Dunshee, *Is Met Gandhi The Answer?* (1 Edn.) (Bombay) Bhambaya Vidya Bhavan, 1961) 49-50. See also, Arun Mehta, *Gandhi and the Nuclear Age* (New Jersey: The Bodley Head Press, 1963) 125-26.
27. *Harjan*, 1942-1955, 509, 548-1947, 250.
28. *Harjan*, 7-7-1934, 173, 30-9-1939, 283, 30-3-1946, 44-45, 22-6-1947, 221, and CWMG, 3, 36-37.
29. M. K. Gandhi, *The Indian Voter's Problem* (1 Edn.) (Ahmedabad: Nirajana Publishing House, 1941) 65.
30. Thomas Marjan, 'The Meaning of Satyagraha', *Gandhi Mary*, V, X, No. 2, 110-12.
31. *Harjan*, 2-4-1931, 4, 3-4-1939, 19, 24-6-1939, 163, and M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 311.
32. CWMG, 9, 100; CWMG, 17, 493.
33. *Harjan*, 4-5-1939, 113. See also G. Ramachandran, 'Gandhi Still Follows The Way', *Gandhi Mary*, V, XI, No. 1, 62. Brackets mine.
34. *Ibid.*, 62. See also CWMG, 10, 127.
35. *Harjan*, 10-6-1945, 64.
36. Richard B. Gregg, 'Satyagraha As A Mirror', *op. cit.*, supra n. 16, 40-43.
37. Ram Ratan, *op. cit.*, 110-113, 110-112.
38. D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, III, 303-49.
39. CWMG, 30, 100, and *Harjan*, 24-6-1938, 173.
40. Mahatma Wilson, *Ghadrakar Error On Disobedience, War and Citizenship* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954) 3-4.
41. CWMG, 19, 210; and M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 179-78.
42. CWMG, 8, 9.
43. Ram Ratan, *op. cit.*, 179-78.
44. CWMG, 13, 263-69.
45. CWMG, 14, 136.
46. M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 312-43; and D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, II, 285-19.
47. *Ibid.*, 1931, II, 31-34, 111-17, *ibid.*, 1932, III, 345-48, CWMG, 13, 219-24, 11 M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 2, 466.
48. D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, II, 186-200, *ibid.*, 1934, VIII, 131-23, and 304-305.
49. M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 321.
50. CWMG, 9, 90; CWMG, 12, 184-97.
51. CWMG, 8, 44-62.
52. Simon Foster-Brock, *op. cit.*, 42.
53. *Ibid.*, 63. See also, *op. cit.*, supra n. 1, 1969, XII, 350-31.
54. W. H. Morris Jones, 'Mahatma Gandhi—Political Philosopher?' *Political Studies* (Oxford) V, VII, No. 1, 35-36.
55. CWMG, 1, 37.
56. CWMG, 4, 302, *Harjan*, 1-4-1939, 71, and 24-6-1939, 178.
57. CWMG, 13, 436-37, CWMG, 14, 144, 171, 213-56, CWMG, 17, 39, M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 373-80; M. K. Gandhi, *op. cit.*, supra n. 3, 2, D. G. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, 1931, I, 190; D. G. Tendulkar, *Gandhi In Champaran* (Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1937) 1-2; Rajendra Prasad, *Satyagraha In Champaran* (Ahmedabad: Nirajana Publishing

- House, (1948) 191-193, 119; R.R. Dinkar, *Satyagraha: Its Philosophy And History* (Bombay: Hind Kashi, 1948) 180, and N.D. Parekh, *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* (Ahmedabad: Navyarn Publishing House, 1956) II, 343-44.
38. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 13, 1931, III, 268, 279, 346-467 and N.E. Bose, *Mp Daga Gandhi* (Calcutta: Nishana, 1953) 40, 148, 165-68, 284, 289, 293, 323, 336-40, 354, 372, 378-79, 384.
39. Ram Ratan, op. cit., 267-68.
40. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 11, 88, and CWMG, 9: 34, 316, CWMG, 10: 73, and CWMG, 12: 440.
41. CWMG, 12: 4.
42. CWMG, 14: 248-15, 347, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 148.
43. CWMG, 4: 484, CWMG, 9: 183, CWMG, 14: 149, CWMG, 23: 102; *Marjies* 28-15-1936, 339, 15-1-1937, 337; 26-5-1945, 194, 25-7-1946, 294; 13-1-1947, 410; 13: 6-1947, 199, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 11, 46, 49.
44. CWMG, 6: 326, CWMG, 13: 603-12, CWMG, 14: 144, CWMG, 15: 113, CWMG, 16: 12, M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 435, 471, D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 372-73; ibid., 1954, VIII, 346-48, and J.S. Sharma, *Indian National Congress & Descriptive Bibliography of India's Struggle for Freedom* (Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1959) 618, 614. About the establishment of the Mass Indian Congress, see op. cit. supra n. 1, 1836, I, 136. The date of its establishment recorded by Gandhi is his Autobiography is incorrect. See M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 167.
45. Anna Mass, op. cit., 134-35.
46. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 476-71.
47. Ibid., and Joan V. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall University Press, 1958) 82.
48. Ibid., 94, and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 13, 1951, II, 6.
49. M.K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha: Nonviolent Resistance* (Ahmedabad: Navayarn Publishing House, 1960) 37.
50. CWMG, 12: 388, CWMG, 1: 1, CWMG, 12: 416.
51. *Marjies*, 7-7-1946, 215.
52. *Marjies* 28: 6-1936, 443; and CWMG, 15: 16.
53. CWMG, 13: 348-69, CWMG, 14: 113, 199; CWMG, 15: 162-163; CWMG, 17: 30-34, D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1951, II, 197; ibid., 1952, III, 25, 193-94, 198, 243, 260 263-64, ibid., 1953, V, 62, 423-25, and R.L. Farquar, *The Indomitable Sardar* (Bombay: Bhambay Vidyut Bhawan, 1962) 54-55.
54. *Marjies*, 6-10-1946, 341.
55. CWMG, 16: 367, and *Marjies* 21-6-1947, 200.
56. *Marjies*, 14-15-1956, 184, M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 11, 73-75, CWMG, 19: 43; and R.D.L. Parashar, 'Ind To A Tree', *Gandhi Marg*, V: 1, No. 4, 137-38.
57. *Marjies* 3: 4-1946, 72, 7-7-1946, 312, and CWMG, 4: 348.
58. CWMG, 15: 423-24, CWMG, 16: 86, *From India* (Ahmedabad) 20-1-1930, 31.
59. CWMG, 9: 320, and *Marjies*, 23-3-1942, 81.
60. *Marjies*, 21-9-1946, 317.
61. CWMG, 3: 403.
62. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 193-95.
63. Ibid., 193, 215; ibid., 1953, VI, 325, 326, and R.R. Dinkar, op. cit. supra n. 57, 173.
64. Joan V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 93-94.
65. CWMG, 13: 258-60, 263-65, 267-68, 637-38; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1953, I, 363, 372.
66. Ibid., 1953, III, 30, 31-33.
67. Ibid., 358-62.

88. CWMG, 19: 113, 127-28, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 469-64.
89. CWMG, 16, 262; CWMG, 18: 280; CWMG, 18: 304-105, 221; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 181, II, 32.
90. Ibid., 1932, III, 10-12.
91. Ibid., 1932, III, 54, 55; S. Sharma, op. cit., 33, 327, 335-36, and R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 173.
92. CWMG, 2: 1, 32, 39; CWMG, 3: 51, 221, 241; and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 297.
93. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 294; and CWMG, 19: 6-7.
94. CWMG, 14, 236, 260-61; CWMG, 19: 199-21, 216-27, 262-294, 321, 322; Jean V. Boudharat, op. cit. supra n. 37, 53; and R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 111.
95. Ram Rattan, op. cit., 221.
96. Jean V. Boudharat, op. cit. supra n. 37, 36, 297.
97. Ibid., 118-19; and CWMG, 3: 463.
98. CWMG, 7: 331, 332, and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 233.
99. K.L. Shrothaman, op. cit., 36.
100. CWMG, 14: 214-22, 218-20.
101. CWMG, 12: 241, 254-55.
102. *Harjan*, 14-5-1942, 183-87; 21-5-1942, 96, 11-4-1943, 307, and 18-4-1947, 274.
103. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 216-27.
104. *Harjan*, 13-10-1939, 280, and 6-4-1946, 73.
105. CWMG, 7: 33-34, 241, 257, 330-34; CWMG, 8: 214-22, 261, 269-80, 452; CWMG, 9: 103, 304-37; CWMG, 13: 113-16, 123, 128-30, and CWMG, 12: 104, 133-36.
106. CWMG, 13: 167-72, 617; CWMG, 15: 199-24, 216-27; D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 124-27, 134, 182; *ibid.*, 1932, III, 49, 74, 264, 266; R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 153-54, 164, 173; and M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 460-62.
107. *Harjan*, 24-7-1946, 257.
108. *Harjan*, 18-4-1940, 253; 24-5-1942, 162; D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1931, III, 1-3, 7-8, 18-19, 26, 30-31, 34, 42-43, 46-47, 52-54, 170, 261, 257; *ibid.*, 1932, IV, 213, 214, *ibid.*, 1932, V, 403, 405, 407, 420, *ibid.*, 1933, VI, 95, 94-95, 193-209, 308, 307, 313-16, 324, 326, 367; M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 462, 498; R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 157, 164, 176-78, 183-85; CWMG, 28: 137.
109. *Harjan*, 14-7-1946, 239.
110. K.L. Shrothaman, op. cit., 44-45.
111. CWMG, 14: 254-75.
112. R.R. Dwekar, op. cit. supra n. 37, 121-22.
113. Jean V. Boudharat, op. cit. supra n. 37, 37; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 193.
114. Ibid., 58; Jean V. Boudharat, op. cit. supra n. 37, 55; and *Young India*, 10-23-1931, 427.
115. Jean V. Boudharat, op. cit. supra n. 37, 37; and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 193.
116. *Harjan*, 11-5-1942, 262-63.
117. CWMG, 8: 283.
118. CWMG, 8: 421.
119. CWMG, 8: 417, 418; CWMG, 9: 126; CWMG, 12: 501.
120. CWMG, 9: 187.
121. Ram Rattan, op. cit., 222-23.
122. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 246.
123. CWMG, 8: 458.
124. CWMG, 13: 549.
125. CWMG, 13: 91.

126. CWMG, 6: 265
127. CWMG, 7: 323-34, 443-44, 530-33; CWMG, 8: 456-57; CWMG, 9: 462, CWMG, 10: 343-54, CWMG, 11: 508-509, 515-16, 593-98
128. CWMG, 10: 504-506, 525, 531. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1931, II, 13, 13-14, 40-43, 69, 75-76, 83-84, *ibid.*, 1952, III, 134-45, 199, and J.S. Sharma, op. cit. 473-75, 481, 520.
129. K.L. Paragkar, op. cit., 59, and Jean V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 53-55
130. CWMG, 9: 40
131. CWMG, 3: 158
132. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 3, 219 (note)
133. K.L. Shrivastava, op. cit., 39. R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 122, 172; J.S. Sharma, op. cit., 478-79, 484, 486, 493, D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1931, II, 44, 53, 69, and *ibid.*, 1952, III, 33, 44
134. *Ibid.*, 1952, III, 50-52; and R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 165-166
135. J.S. Sharma, op. cit., 457-58, 462, 471, 483, 482, 507, 526, *Indian Review* (Madras) V XXII, No. 3, p. 799, Jean V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 53-54, 94; R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 123, K.L. Paragkar, op. cit., 60-62, and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1932, III, 34, 44
136. *Varjjan* 11-3-1939, 46-47; 24-7-1942, 248; 5-16-1947, 354; 21-11-1948, 531. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 2, 121, 152, 342-43. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 29, 515, CWMG, 21: 352-43, 392, and Mahadev Desai, *The Great of Sardar Arjun or The Gita According to Gandhi* (1 Edn., FF Imp.; Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1951) 168
137. *Varjjan* 11-3-1939, 47, 26-7-1942, 248, and D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 249-50
138. *Ibid.*, 1952, III, 159. *Varjjan*, 4-3-1933, 1; 11-3-1938, 47, 13-16-1943, 322; 28-7-1947, 344, and CWMG, 25: 201
139. *Varjjan* 11-3-1939, 46; 25-11-1939, 349; 24-7-1942, 248, and *Prasthal*, op. cit., 52
140. M.K. Gandhi, op. cit. supra n. 29, 513, CWMG, 21: 467, *Varjjan*, 11-3-1939, 46; 16-13-1942, 24; 21-4-1948, 53; 12-8-1947, 394, 14-8-1947, 318 and 23-3-1948, 335.
141. Ben Bhatia, op. cit., 283-93
142. Mahadev Desai, *The Story of Sardar* (1 Edn., Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1957) 129
143. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1952, III, 239-46.
144. *Ibid.*, 1951, II, 13, R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 157, and Jean V. Bondurant, op. cit. supra n. 47, 55
145. D.G. Tendulkar, op. cit. supra n. 17, 1953, VI, 21-24, *Varjjan*, 14-1-1948, 417; 18-8-1948, 329, and 21-3-1948, 261
146. R.B. Desai, op. cit. supra n. 37, 31.

# Gandhi Marg

## TITLE, AUTHOR, SUBJECT-IN-TITLE INDEX TO VOLUME SIXTEEN 1972

- Action, faith and, rediscovery of 187
- American officials, Gandhi, civil disobedience and 45
- Anand, Mulk Raj 105, 212
- Andrews, Dhanubandha, a communist and tribals 15
- Appadorai, A. 99
- Bag, M.R.A. 104
- Bala-chandrasekaran, V. 97
- Bangla Desh and all that it is dreamt of 5
- Bangla Desh, India after 85
- Bangla Desh, India and 237
- Bangla Desh's historic destiny 81
- Birth of a nation in blood and tears 1
- Bishop, Donald H. 16
- Brijvaran 229
- Bristol, James E. 266
- Byles, Marie B. 152, 252
- Civil disobedience and American officials, Gandhi 45
- The continuity of offensiveness and the covenant of peace 258
- Conciliation, resistance and, the Via Yang of 192
- Das, Durga 89
- Dhanubandha Andrews, a communist tribals 15
- Deshgunde, A.S. 29
- Deshkar, R.R. 121, 163
- Douglas, James W. 192
- Ecological crisis, India and 157
- Edwards L. 81, 157, 235
- Ends and means 76
- Environment, human, problems of 212
- Faith, action and, rediscovery of 187
- A foreign policy for peace 234
- Friedman, Maurice 238
- The future of nonviolence in social change 179
- Future population trends and prospects 256
- Gandhi, a meditation on 8
- Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed, meditations on 189
- Gandhi and Tolstoy, religion and political process in 278
- Gandhi, civil disobedience and American officials 45
- Gandhi, M.K. 167
- Gandhi, not back to but forward to 235
- Gandhism: a political interpretation 81
- Gandhism, principles and postulates of 29
- Gargis Jr., W. Lawrence 147
- Goold, James Warren 179
- Gupta, Smt 98
- Hyslop, Thomas 269
- India after Bangla Desh 85
- India, ancient, theory of resistance in 57
- India and Bangla Desh 227
- India and the ecological crisis 157
- The India-Pakistan crisis at the

- United Nations 124
- Force not so obvious but of concern to the world community 121
- Iyer, V R. Krishna 111
- Jack, Henry A. 117, 124
- Jan, Ghislai 87
- Jha, Manomayan 45
- The king's new clothes 162
- Linton, John 227
- Machine, man or 167
- Maitra, K. R. 93
- Manickam, D.R. 91
- Man or machine? 167
- A meditation on Gandhi 8
- Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostolic Creed 289
- Mishra, G.L. 94
- Monkberg, S.D. 74
- Morkhandriat, R.S. 57
- Mumford, Lewis 171
- Needful basis of violence and non-violence 132
- Newcombe, Alan G. 294
- Nonviolence not first for export 288
- Nonviolence, in social change, future of 179
- Nonviolence, presuppositions of 18
- Nonviolence, violence and, needful basis of 132
- Not back to but forward to Gandhi 735
- Outline of a peace studies program 308
- Patel, B. K. 114
- Peace, a foreign policy for 254
- Peace studies program, a, outline of 308
- Peace, covenant of, and the community of others 238
- The Pentagon of power 171
- Population, future, trends and prospects 258
- Power, the Pentagon of 171
- The presuppositions of nonviolence 18
- Principles and postulates of Gandhism 19
- Problems of the human environment 212
- Ramachandran, G. 15, 187
- Rediscovery of faith and action 187
- Religion and political process in Gandhi and Tolstoy 278
- Resistance, contemplation and, the Yin-Yang of 192
- Resistance, in ancient India, theory of 157
- Sankhdher, M.M. 68
- Sengh, Khushwant 187
- Sn Atchindola's philosophy, its universality 183
- Subrahmanyam, K. 101
- Tauber, Irene B. 258
- Thapar, Romesh 106
- The theory of resistance in ancient India 57
- Thoughts on the road to Stockholm 147
- Tolstoy, Gandhi and, religion and political process in 278
- Tolstoy, Leo 162
- Tyagi, G. 8
- Violence, and nonviolence, the needful basis of 132
- Wagner, Chen 278
- The Yin-Yang of resistance and contemplation 192



## IN BACK NUMBERS

**1965**

**January**

- William R. Miller : Gandhi and King—Pioneers of Modern Nonviolence  
T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to the Study of Gandhi  
S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

**April**

- A. Controversy : The Meaning of Gandhi  
Robert Payne : The Inheritance of Gandhi  
Hélène De Solé Pool : Violence in Villages  
Spartak Nelson : Casts and Untouchability—and Gandhi

**July**

- R.R. Diwaker : The Lokamanya and the Mahatma  
Shabani Bhattacharya : Some Reflections on Gandhi the Writer  
Esme Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and the God-Idea  
S. M. Tiwari : Four Questions on Gandhi's Philosophy

**October**

- Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and Social Revolution  
A. S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social Philosophy  
Rosalind Schama : The Obligations of the Individual  
B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as a Source of his Influence

**1970**

**January**

- Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and Dissent in America  
George Lukes : Strategy for Non-violent Revolution  
James E. Bristol : The Draft Recall Movement in the United States  
Johanna Bosch : Erikson's Gandhi

**April**

- T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Advaita of Mahatma Gandhi  
K. G. Salyadein : Gandhi's Loveable Personality  
P. Nagaraja Rao : The Gandhian Concept of Dharma  
Lyn Bowmen : Totalitarianism or Nonviolence?

**July**

- Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of Citizenship  
K. Senthanam : Gandhi's Way of Life  
R. R. Diwaker : Dynamics of Ahimsa  
Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National Defence Strategist

**October**

- Groot Coen : The Gans : 1914-1918  
James D. Hunt : Thoreau and Gandhi : A Re-evaluation of the Legacy  
T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in the Seventies  
T. K. N. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARS  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

1971

## January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

(In) Loretta Pastowska : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

## April

James W. Douglass : The Revolution to the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

N. G. S. Kiri : Techniques and Tools of Gandhian Revolution

K. Gupleswar : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

## July

Gerald Harewitz : The Idea of a Mass Deontic Movement

Johan Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erskine's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murti : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

## October

Karek Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : India and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U.S. Navy

Ramakrishna Venkay : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

## January

G. Teets : A Meditation on Gandhi  
Donald H. Bishop : The Presuppositions of Nonviolence

Manoranjan Jha : Gandhi, Civil Disobedience and American Officials

R.S. Mohandasakar : The Theory of Resistance in Ancient India

## April

Symposium : India After Bangla Desh

Homer A. Jack : The India-Pakistan Crisis at the U.N.

W. L. Georges Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Merle B. Sykes : Needful Basis of Violence and Nonviolence

## July

Lewis Mumford : The Pentagon of Power

James Warren Gould : The Future of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Diwakar : Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy : Its Universality

James W. Douglass : The Yia-Yang of Resistance and Contemplation

## October

Maurice Friedman : The Community of Otherness and the Co-vent of Peace

James E. Bristol : Nonviolence not First for Export

James J. Preston : Religion and Political Process in Gandhi and Tolstoy

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

17/2



Vol. 17. No. 2. APRIL. 1973

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

# GANDHI MARG

□ HASER ON THE THREAT SOCIETY □ FRANKLIN  
ON THE MANIA OF MOBILITY □ OVERY ON RADICALISM AND REVOLUTION □ MALHOTRA ON  
CONTEXTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF GANDHI □  
□ BYLES ON WORK AS SELF-EFFACEMENT □

## IN BACK NUMBERS

1967

January

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism  
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic  
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference  
P. Nagendra Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Atimesa

April

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd  
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance  
Jerzy Sawicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research  
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

July

Martin Luther King : The Casualties of the War in Vietnam  
John R. Resser : The Concept of Deterrence  
R. R. Dawkins : Gandhi and Man in Evolution  
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

October

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi  
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love  
Karen Monson and Martin Grotzahn : Racial Prejudice and the Incest Taboo  
T. V. Perera : Tilak and Gandhi

1968

January

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities  
Merle B. Byles : Truth is God  
Jayaprakash Narayan : The Outlook for Peace in India  
Reigh David Abernathy : Religion and World Peace

April

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare  
Bo Winmark : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence  
T.K. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation  
Noam Chomsky : The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste

July

Maurice Friedman : Martin Luther King As American Gandhi and a Modern Job  
Mylford G. Sibley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution  
Steven Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign  
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

October

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence?  
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?  
H.J.N. Hoernburgh : Nonviolence and Impotence  
R. R. Dawkins : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

# GANDHI MARG 65

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER TWO APRIL 1973

## Editors

G. Ramachandran

T. K. Mahadevan

## Editorial Board

R. R. Diwakar

J. B. Kripalani

Jayaprakash Narayan

Abid Hussain

Vijaya Hari

G. Ramachandran

Shriman Narayan

Bhawan Prasad Mishra

Radhakrishna

Davendra Kumar Gupta

T. K. Mahadevan (Convener)

# Contents

|                   |     |   |
|-------------------|-----|---|
| Editorials        | 107 | The tragic statement                            |
|                   | 110 | Limits to knowledge                             |
| John R. Ruse      | 115 | The threat society                              |
| Roger Franklin    | 126 | 'Is your journey necessary?'                    |
| L. Jesudasan      | 133 | A poetic celebration of the Mahatma's martyrdom |
| Cecilie Maierlein | 138 | Martyrdom of Gandhi                             |
| Bob Overy         | 141 | Approaches to nonviolent revolution             |
| S. L. Malhotra    | 150 | Some characteristics of Gandhi's thought        |
| Thomas Hyslop     | 158 | Madrigals on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—II  |
| Marie B. Byles    | 167 | What is the most worthwhile work?               |

Rs. 7.50 a year in South Asia; \$ 2.50 elsewhere: postfree. Rs. 3.00 (\$ 1.00) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates: 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Cheque/drafts about non-receipt: (delayed) within 15 days; (resent) within 30 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money order only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 120-123 Dron Dajal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi and printed by him at the Kaper Printing Press, New Delhi. [Library of Congress Card No. 39-43114]

## Editorials

---

### THE TRAGIC STALEMATE

Indo-Pakistan relations still continue to be tragic beyond words. Never once since the partition of India has there been even a spasm of genuine goodwill between the two nations. Both India and Pakistan have lived in a state of armed neutrality and confrontation. Three times we have had eruptions of war. India is convinced that she never was the aggressor and Pakistan has convinced herself that every time she was defending her honour and integrity. World opinion has shifted and swung from one side to another as it suited the self-interest of the powers concerned. On a clear and broad basis, however, international opinion has aimed to create a balance of power between India and Pakistan.

In the earlier wars, which ended in settlements brought about by the intervention of bigger powers, even while the world knew that India had the upper hand in the battles that were fought, Pakistan had sought to create the fiction that if there had been no settlement it would have smashed India! The unchangeable Pakistani idea was always that one Pakistan soldier was the equal of five Indian soldiers and that in a war to the finish the Pakistan army could start Delhi within a few weeks. On previous occasions this fiction probably paid some dividend to the reputation of Pakistan. But in the last war nothing was left to conjecture or to the delectable art of fiction. The Indian army won an outright and complete victory in the east, with the result that the entire body of Pakistani troops in Bangladesh surrendered unconditionally. In the west, all the concentrated might of Pakistani armour failed to hold the ground against India. President Nixon has revealed that the Indian army was poised for an unprecedented victory on the western front also. But as soon as the war of liberation in Bangladesh was over, India declared a unilateral truce which Pakistan accepted with alacrity. The world, including Pakistan, no longer believes in the story of one Pakistani soldier being equal to five Indian soldiers. This nonsense is now dead as a doornail. In the reported words of a distinguished British Army

Officer, military action by the Indian army in Bangladesh was one of the quickest, most brilliantly executed and thorough known in the annals of modern warfare.

The above facts are adduced not in a spirit of braggadoos. It is just an unadorned statement of facts. No one doubts any more that the Indian army won an complete victory as any army in the world at any time. But Prime Minister Indira Gandhi proved herself to be a genius in this situation. What she demonstrated was not her genius for war but her greater genius for peace. She not only declared unilateral truce after having won the war but took the astonishing step of negotiating for a durable peace. She assumed no pose of a victor. Her approach to Pakistan after victory was that of a genuine friend who had not the slightest idea of humiliating Pakistan. With high-minded generosity she held out her hand of friendship and cooperation to defeated Pakistan. She never said a word or made any gesture of a conqueror. She was almost diffident for the victory she was compelled to win.

It would be of considerable interest to compare for a moment the so-called unilateral truce which China threw in the face of India after her brief military incursion in the north-east of India. China found that in a mad moment of anger and false prestige she had run her army a little deeper into India than she should have and withdrew her troops calling it a unilateral truce. What did follow? Nothing except the arrogant assumption of victory by China with nothing done to follow up the truce, if it was a truce at all. The ugly gulf between China and India has continued for years with only some small thaw in recent months. But look at the example set by India after completely winning the war with Pakistan and with Pakistan surrendering unconditionally. India went out of her way to invite Pakistan to settle across peacefully across the table. As a result the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India met in Simla and thrashed out an agreement of peace and goodwill.

The Simla agreement, excellent in itself, was more significant for what it could lead to. The President and the Prime Minister parted as good friends. Mahatma Gandhi had always emphasized that nonviolence to be worth the name should be that of the strong and not the weak. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi handling with magnificent courage, patience and goodwill the liberation of Bangladesh from a terrible tyranny, solving at one stroke after long travail the problem of ten million refugees cast on the soil of India by the same tyranny and then suddenly switching from war to peace, proved herself to be the greatest Gandhian of our time in regard to this vital and complex issue.

But alas, President Bhutto has again proved how unpredictable he is as the leader of Pakistan. He is still in the grip of his old mania



for confrontation with India as though that attitude alone can build up his prestige in Pakistan. He swears he will never agree to India's hegemony in the sub-continent. This is a fantastic repudiation of something which India has never sought. India has never aimed at the hegemony of the sub-continent. Not a word from the Prime Minister of India, nor any gesture of her Government can be focused to indicate that India is seeking this hegemony. It was Pandit Nehru who had, in his day, repeatedly affirmed that India aimed at no leadership in the sub-continent or in Asia or anywhere.

The present Prime Minister is in line with the realistic and nobly humble attitude of her great father. She has made it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that her aim is friendship and cooperation among the three equals in the sub-continent, namely, Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. She seeks no undue advantage from the triumph of the Indian army in Bangladesh. She has proved this by action in the surrender of territories acquired in the war and the return of all prisoners taken on the western front. It does not, however, seem to suit President Bhutto to accept the friendship and goodwill of India. He continues to indulge in shadow fighting. Can anything be more injurious to Pakistan than the non-recognition of Bangladesh, which is now an unbreakable reality within the family of nations and sovereign states. Even some of the Arab nations, and the United States itself, among nearly a hundred countries, have recognised Bangladesh.

Nothing is today more ridiculous than for Pakistan to still talk of an East Pakistan, which is no more. While President Bhutto is finding it extraordinarily difficult to frame a constitution and hold together, in friendship and cooperation, the provinces of Sind, Baluchistan, Pakhtoonistan and West Punjab, Bangladesh within record time has evolved its own constitution and held the first general elections under it. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is now for the second time holding power by the unanimous verdict of his people. Pakistan can get all its prisoners of war released tomorrow if President Bhutto has the common sense to come to terms with the reality of Bangladesh.

India is no enemy of Pakistan, nor will Bangladesh be an enemy of Pakistan. President Bhutto is his own enemy and he is already paying a heavy price in the opposition and uncertainties he has himself created in West Pakistan. The tragic stalemate between India and Pakistan is his achievement. Is destiny setting its trap for this well-intentioned but volatile leader of Pakistan that he should not escape the consequences of his own past actions? President Bhutto should know that the world still remembers how he abetted in the destruction of Bangladesh through sheer brutality under Yahya Khan. The longer the President delays in settling with Bangladesh and India, the tighter would be destiny's rope round his neck. We can only exclaim in wonder and sorrow why what

is so obvious except his restless mind.

India would wish nothing better than that President Bhutto is able to hold the component parts of West Pakistan firmly together in friendship and cooperation and thus establish a great and democratic republic under his leadership. Nothing would suit India better. But India can do nothing to help President Bhutto against himself. Let him not abet fate in preparing a tragic fate for himself. How we wish he would read the writing on the wall and put himself right with his own people and with Bangladesh without delay. United, prosperous and equal, the unity of states in the sub-continent can become a mighty bulwark of democracy in Asia and set a shining example of how when enmity among peoples gives place to friendship, it can lead to an explosion of freedom, prosperity and happiness for them all.

G. RAMACHANDRAN

## LIMITS TO KNOWLEDGE

We have argued in the recent past that the essence of the present human crisis, for which there are no historical precedents, is that it is a CRISIS OF EXCESS. Man is caught in the vortex of several intermeshing explosions from which there seems no way of escape. Among them, the population explosion is now a byword. So is the explosion of technology—and its concomitant of creeping environmental pollution. But at the root of it all is the KNOWLEDGE EXPLOSION. We know much more than is good for us.

Without being unduly optimistic, one can still take the position that all the explosions except this one are manageable. One can, for example, visualize future technologies which are both non-pollutant and depollutant. One can even hope for populations to begin to stabilize at some point in the foreseeable future and eventually to come down to more flexible levels. The danger of an exploding nuclear war, on the other hand, is already nothing more than an unpleasant memory. What, however, man will find hardest to tame is his exploding knowledge.

The report of the so-called Club of Rome, *Limits to Growth*, is already a warning of a sort. What it communicates is not the final voice of some human being but a computer revelation. The computer, after all, is the modern oracle. When the computer speaks, we must give heed.

Rudely awakened from their day-dreaming, some of the champions of modern technology have begun to question that revelation. For example, in the University of Sussex they claim to have fed the same

information into another computer and come out with different results. On our part, we would rather that the Club of Rome's forebodings turn out to be true. Indeed we would welcome them with open arms. For the sooner we run out of fuel the better. No fuel, no technology. Back to the bullockcart, the plough and the charkhra. Back to the silent contemplation of stars on pitch-dark nights. In other words, the Club of Rome's report, far from being horrifying, is a blessing in disguise.

But it has always been man's fate to get out of one problem only to get into another. For after we shall have got rid of the technological explosion, plus all the other explosions that flow from it, we will still have on our hands the problem of man's expanding knowledge. How are we going to bring *that* under control? The knowledge explosion is a self-propelling, self-accelerating process. It uses liquid state computers (transistors, if you like) and these draw their energy not from fossil fuels but from anything that is humanly edible! Such sources of human food are still plentiful. At any rate, when the collapse of technology shall have brought about an automatic reduction in population, scarcity of food will cease to be a problem.

At the base of the Knowledge Explosion is the Knowledge Industry—probably the most intractable manifestation of man's thirst for power. For above all, knowledge is power and excess of knowledge leads not to wisdom but to an excess of power. And power not only corrupts. Power destroys.

The Knowledge Explosion is destructive in two ways. One of these is expressed in the paradox that 'the more we know the less we know'. In the midst of the super-abundance of collective knowledge, individual men and women are being reduced to such a state of ignorance (euphemistically called speciality) that they are no longer anything more than Chaplinesque cogs in the mega-machine.

Short of a miracle, how will man get over this seemingly insurmountable obstacle? By a simple device. By an act of renunciation. By agreeing to set limits to human knowledge. By rejecting the myth that knowledge is an end in itself. By refusing to play God and by cutting human knowledge to human size.

Renunciation—that is the magic word. We have talked endlessly of socialization of knowledge without reaching anywhere. Similarly ineffective has been the notion of works (discrimination). Men just are incapable of discriminating between what is beneficial and what is pleasurable—and making the right choice.

But men are still capable of renouncing, of calling a halt. Thus far and no farther. The recent agreement between the two super-powers to give up the race for ABM systems is a fair example of what is feasible. The residual capability in man is our last hope.

Let the capture of the Knowledge Industry, the scientists above all,

work towards achieving this act of resurrection. Let them begin now, before it is too late.

Let all nations (both the highly advanced and the less advanced) see the writing on the wall and cooperate in formulating a universal declaration on Limits to Knowledge.

T. K. MAHADEVAN

---

## *Gandhi Marg*

### STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PARTICULARS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Place of Publication                                   | New Delhi   |
| Periodicity of Publication                             | Quarterly   |
| Publisher's Name                                       | T.K. Mahadevan  |
| Nationality  | Indian  |
| Address  | 228 & 229 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg,<br>New Delhi   |
| Publisher's Name                                       | T.K. Mahadevan  |
| Nationality  | Indian  |
| Address  | 221 & 224 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg,<br>New Delhi   |
| Editor's Name  | G. Ramachandran & T.K. Mahadevan  |
| Nationality  | Indian  |
| Address  | 228 & 229 Dasm Bazar Upadhyaya Marg,<br>New Delhi   |
| Name and address of individuals<br>who own the journal | The Journal is owned by the Gandhi<br>Trust Foundation, 221 & 224 Dasm Bazar<br>Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi |

I, T.K. Mahadevan, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated, 15 April 1951

Sd. T.K. Mahadevan  
Publisher

# *The threat society*

JOHN R. KASER

DURING SEVERAL YEARS OF SERIOUS RESEARCH and questioning I have become increasingly convinced that the major institutions of human culture—at least as they have developed in the West—are built upon foundations of threat. Why should this be so? Perhaps it is a cultural accident, perhaps it is innate in our natures, perhaps we are just not yet far enough removed from our heritage of tooth and claw to have discovered a better way. In America especially, it seems to me, the reliance upon threats to produce both stability and change—depending upon which is desired—has been carried to the extreme. This is the pervasive germ which implants our body politic with the mark of the beast.

There are those who would certainly dispute with this point of view. Herbert Marcuse, for example, sometimes makes the claim that unlike most societies of the past, advanced industrial society is organized around a reward system rather than a threat system. The oppressed of the culture are not driven into their oppression, rather they are misled and seduced into it. I believe that this is true only in very limited areas inside industrial societies and true almost not at all in their dealings with the rest of the world. For the most part, it is clear to me that the driving force of social order is threat. The entire legal system, from traffic control through tax and civil law to criminal sanctions, is based on threats. So is the conduct of foreign relations from 'containment' through nuclear deterrence. So too, though perhaps to a lesser extent, are our child-rearing and educational practices, for in these areas also it is the fear of punishment or failure which is relied upon to motivate 'correct' behaviour. In industrial relations, professional activities, race relations, protest movements, and even in religion, the use of threats is, if not ubiquitous, certainly a fundamental feature.

If we are to begin to comprehend why what is happening in America and the world is happening, we must begin to explore the dynamics of

threats. Only if it begins to become clearer how people and groups react to their etc., only if we begin to understand how and when they work and how and when they do not work as behaviour controlling devices, only when we begin to glimpse the complex relationships between a steady diet of threats as a culture and the overall shape of that culture, only then will we begin to gain some hints as to how we might make the transition to a different kind of world, a world in which a new dynamic force has been found to replace that hoary one which appears to have sired so much misery and error. Fortunately for the social critic who is interested in these matters, there is a growing body of research and theory which can be used to supplement and inform our own experience. There is the whole mass of behavioural "reward-punishment" conditioning work. Irving Janis, as *Persuasion*, has marshalled the evidence from decades of research, which shows that a threat which arouses fear and/or anger causes an improvement in mental functioning at low levels (that is, an improvement over a state of no threat at all) but a massive deterioration and collapse at high levels. Milton Rokach, in *The Open and Closed Mind*, has brought together a wealth of evidence on the effects of a chronic state of threat on individuals, and even more interesting, on the extent to which large and complex institutions such as the Catholic church respond to threats to institutional viability with dogmatism, gnosticism, and authoritarianism. Walter Cannon, in *Body Changes in Pain, Rage, Hunger and Fear*, has shown how some threat situations increase the physiological capabilities of the body but erode mental processes. Alexander Lowen has demonstrated in *The Betrayal of the Body* how panic depresses breathing and shuts off feeling and thought. There are a dozen other familiar books and a hundred or more lesser known research reports. And, somewhat unusually for the behavioural sciences, there is a high degree of correspondence among them. If one uses a not terribly complex model of explanation, findings on the effects of threat on the body, the mind, and society, are quite in agreement and quite consistent with what we would already suspect if we stopped to think about our personal experience. What follows is based upon this body of evidence.

□

A.A. Milne has captured the essence of what happens to a person subjected to sudden threat with his whimsical account of the confusion suffered by Pooh's friend, Piglet, when he unexpectedly stumbles upon an operation which he believes to be an elephant. "Help, help!" cried Piglet, "a Hellsnump, a Horrible Hellsnump!" and he scampered off as hard as he could, still crying out, "Help, help, a Horrible Hellsnump! Hellsnump, Hellsnump! Hellsnump! Hellsnump! Hellsnump! Hellsnump!" And he didn't stop crying and scampering until he got to Christopher Robin's

house.

And Arthur Koestler, in his usual succinct way, tells us why it happens: "In rage and panic, the sympatho-adrenal apparatus tyrannizes the whole . . ." (*The Act of Creation*).

Despite the fact that we all know that confusion and poor functioning can follow the application of the threats, we still persist in trying to use them to control the behaviour of others. Certainly one explanation for this is the fact that in some uncomplicated situations they work very well and we know it. For example, they are great for shooting animals.

"You will never get that blasted cat to stay off the table until you scare him off!" says my wife. She is right, of course. Unfortunately such simple solutions don't work nearly as well when we are dealing with Romans or the Panthers or Richard Nixon or our children, or others of those complex members of the human species whose behaviour we would like so much to control.

To begin with, people usually don't think very well when they are being threatened. We all know this. Even so simple, cold, and efficient a threat as a highway patrol car seen in the rear view mirror will cause most motorists to commit driving errors in their anxiety to avoid trouble—a fact which at least American patrolmen, eager to boost their output of citations, know only too well. And the fact that almost everyone will meekly submit to that situation is probably due largely to the threat of the gun at the hip and the power of the law, though practically no one (and recently perhaps) really would believe on a rational level that he would be shot for breaking traffic laws or disobeying a highway patrolman.

More profound levels of threat will evoke equally more profound reactions. When the threat becomes so acute that real fear of death, painful injury or severe loss triggers what we call terror, then all the responses so familiar to our emotions and nightmares flood our organism. Intense psychological stress characterizes this level, as do major physiological changes. The mind is trapped in a desperate search for escape, the future collapses into the next moment, reasoning power gives way to automatic reactions. Psychologists call this the "premotor" effect of intense threat or crisis. At the physiological level, the organism is readied to fight or to flee. Adrenalin enters the system, blood sugar increases, the heart and lungs speed up and deepen their pumping, the palms and armpits perspire, the eyes dilate, the hair on the body stands on end. The terrified primate persuades the brain. Pain and rage, incidentally, share with fear the prelude for mobilizing the body while paralyzing the ordered mind.

(It is in this fact that our technical achievements as weaponry have trapped us in a most bizarre way. If we think of 'man the warrior' we come to realize how. It used to be that the warrior fought with sword,

club, axe, or on the battlefield with gun and bayonet. The crisis conditions of pain, rage and fear, which mobilized his body and dulled his logical capacities, served him well. Of such stuff were heroes made. But now, when the warrior is a technician, when his function is to fly a plane or command a nuclear submarine or analyse the flood of important data in a war room, then the response of the body to crisis betrays him. For his throbbing body has become an enemy of the cool mind and decision-making ability which are so badly needed. We are caught as brains in a web of machinery and our muscles atrophy. We have tricked ourselves, for those crisis responses which served fighting Homo Sapiens for a million years have now become the Achilles heel which may carry us all to sheer destruction.)

But at what levels of threat do such social control mechanisms as legal sanctions or nuclear deterrence fail? It is hard to be certain, for no one has studied the inner reactions people in general have to these threats. Presumably the run-of-the-mill population thinks little and cares less about such distant abstractions, and it is mainly the dissident, the would-be criminal, or the military commander who consciously feels threatened. Yet, we try to make the threats immediate. Newspaper stories and the TV news dratch us with the gore of our vengeance on Blacks, niggers, prisoners, or foreign peasants who resist. One would be inclined to conclude that everyone must respond to the level of threat in the culture set as an abstract notion but as a real fear evoking an image of potential pain.

Much the same would seem to be true of the nuclear threat overshadowing our lives despite the reassuring language of the military who prefer to talk of 'population response' instead of unnumbered people or of 'floor space' instead of devastated cities. On the *Scotch, Age and Essence*, and *Dr Strangelove* vividly depict the death threat of civilization. Movies, newspaper reports, magazine articles, and scientific journals we with one another in painting the doomsday aspects of nuclear war. Scholars tell us how nearly inevitable it is. The threat is driven home to all but the most obtuse. Here though, it is not primarily the advocates of nuclear deterrence strategies who are the ardent portrayers of holocaust, but the opponents. Paradoxically then, these opponents may serve the very policies they abhor: by escalating the height of the populace they may induce the very denial, irrational thinking and subversive political mood which render impotent attempts to alter the policy.

However, despite occasional acute concern, the nuclear threat, like the fear of lung cancer for the heavy smoker or of a fatal overdose for the heroin addict, must be relegated to the mid-levels in the perceptual systems of most people. While it would certainly be the ultimate crisis, should it occur, its abstractness and perceived low probability means that



the reactions to extreme threat I mentioned earlier are mostly absent. It does, however, have an equally pernicious quality which is shared with the other sources of threat mentioned above. *It is chronic.* Captive duty by the roar and stink of military jets and the news, fuelled by our awareness of the arms race and recurrent crises, it cuts its way into our psyche and creates what psychologists call anxiety. The constant presence of anxiety has its own load of detrimental effects on cognitive and physical functioning and on social organization. Cognitively, it fosters dogmatism, denial, positiveness, defensiveness, rigidity—in short, low levels of adaptability or creativity. Physically, it leads to insomnia, anorexia, constipation, and loss of sexual drive—symptoms which in turn become the causes of new types of cognitive disability. Socially it leads to paranoia, vindictiveness and authoritarian institutions.

A state of chronic anxiety, however, need not be uniquely the result of chronic threat, as in the case of the nuclear spectre which hangs over us decade after decade. It may also be the result of a single traumatic experience. Therapists are all too familiar with bodies and psyches which have been permanently warped by a single childhood experience of terror or panic. There is evidence that soldiers stunned with shock on the battlefield still suffer anxieties almost too powerful to bear as much as 10 years later. Other research reveals that a single injection of sodium (a drug which causes paralysis and intense panic for a few seconds), when coupled with a tone, will so traumatize an individual that the sound of that tone more than a year later will cause renewed panic. Thus it is conceivable that one really had nuclear wars could raise the level of chronic anxiety permanently, especially since the constant threat is real and the reminders are constant. One is reminded of the film version of H.G. Wells' *The Time Machine*. In this story, the gentle race of humans who dwell above ground a thousand years from now march robot-like to the subterranean tunnels when the noon wails—there to be butchered and eaten by the burrowing race. Presumably they had been fully and permanently conditioned by a former nuclear war, with the conditioning handed on from generation to generation. At a less fantastic level, it is quite legitimate to conclude from the evidence that a single traumatic experience can so alter a person's (or a society's) ability to function effectively as to significantly reduce its survival potential.

As for our current generation, we think that we have learned how, if not to love the bomb, at least to live with it. Few of us seem to think much about it any more. The denial mechanism is in full bloom. But the bomb is still there, and growing yearly. Even more discouraging, with each year its control passes further out of the hands of individual human beings and deeper into the complexities of bureaucratic and technical systems. And such systems have already, I think, proven

themselves even more senseless, erratic, and destructive than individual men. We may yet be mesmerized, but increasingly the chances are that it will be not in rage and passion but in error, or as the result of a soulless logic thrust into a decision system somewhere in the vast network of specialized activity which assumes the world's weaponry. We pretend that we know so well how to organize and rule ourselves, our world and our machines, but we know almost nothing and think seriously about the consequences of cumulative decisions even less. We may well blow up our world, and if we do, anyone who is around a hundred years from now is to look back and reconstruct how it happened in almost certain to say, "Of course." Sometimes there seems a certain inevitability about it.

(One must suppose too that the bomb is pretty passé, perhaps kept around mostly for its phallic attraction. The ominous ones—the gases and bacteria and weather controls and electronic devices, must by now be far more resolved and deadly.)

We're tired, and we don't pay much attention any more. Most people couldn't tell you what an MIRV is. Why try? We feel so helpless in the face of the threat. We can't fight, so we flee. And we flee in many directions. But whenever we flee in our denial of the nuclear threat, it seems we encounter new terrors.

Thus the nuclear spectre of the '50s and '60s has been largely supplanted since 1970 by a fear of ecocide, and species suicide through revolutionary war, reproduction, run-away consumption, and social collapse. Increasingly too, and especially among the young, there is a growing fear of a malevolent 'they', an established system of dominance crushing joy and freedom with its inexorable bureaucratic logic which grinds all human potential through the mill of power and profit. Its face is the parody face of the self-righteous politician and businessman, its works are the works of violence and death, its daily symbols are the cruiser, the helmet, the club and the tear-gas canister. It is hated and despised, but more than that, it is feared—feared with the hopeless despair for the future that leads many to the blind outrage of a children's revolution and others to the blind passivity of the needle and the bottle. Fight or flight—it is a choice as ancient as life itself.

What of those situations where neither fight nor flight is possible? Such would be the case for the masses of the world. The normal man can do nothing. He must simply 'swallow his terror' and live with it. Much the same is true of even a soldier, such as the commander of a nuclear submarine. He can't really use the body his terror has prepared for battle. He must sit still, evaluate information coming over meters, and at best push a few buttons. Studies show that this kind of threat situation, where there is no possibility of acting to cope with it, has the most pernicious effects of all. Some animals simply die in such situations. Humans don't ordinarily die, they act in inappropriate ways. Some

dozens, some lash out readily at nothing, some just drop the threat, some undertake elaborate but meaningless rituals of defence (bomb shelters, for example). All of these have disastrous effects. One explanation of the hawkish bent of the American public is that this belligerence is the only possible outlet for the frustration and rage generated by the perpetual terror of the age. This would be true of the older generation at least. The young are hawks of a different feather. Their hatred is directed not so much against the Soviets or the Communists or other foreign enemies as against the Pig, the Polluter, and the President.

The agonizing reality is probably itself largely a legacy of the days of nuclear terror. It was that terror and the worldview which it fostered which set the stage for militarism at home and abroad, mistreatment of dissenters, and a casual acceptance of unskilled violence for the supposed accomplishment of the most trivial or abstract of ends.

Many years ago Harold Lasswell, in his *The Garrison State*, predicted how this would happen when he told us that in a nation obsessed with fear of enemies, power would increasingly fall into the hands of specialists on violence. It is doing so now in America. While the American military patrol and pacifies the world, the local police and their national nerve centres patrol and pacify the neighbourhoods. Their hedges soar, their numbers proliferate, while adequate education, medical care, food, and a clean environment are given short shrift indeed. And to a lesser extent the same is true of most of the rest of the world.

Not everyone agrees with Lasswell. External threat is often lauded as the fuel of patriotism and national commitment. Mao is quoted as saying that if there had been no hostile America he would have had to invent one to consolidate China and rally her masses to impossible tasks. Machiavelli counselled princes to cultivate the fear of external enemies to eliminate dissent at home. It's the 'Rally round the flag' phenomenon. But this is not the whole story. External threat does cement the members of a group, but in bitter bonds. It makes them feel more dependent on one another for safety and thus less tolerant of dissent, it makes them more willing to man blindly behind a leader, it makes them cling neurotically to one another for emotional support. We have all seen this. At the same time, it is most destructive of the real human sympathy among the members of the group. Fear of the enemy dominates love for the friend. Hating the common pligh, each member secretly looks for a private escape. The 'cohesiveness' of the group, while not illusory, is pernicious rather than beneficial. Community is transformed into an oppressive collective. The enhanced 'esprit de corps', the heightened patriotism generated in the face of a common danger, are in fact and enduring only for a brief moment at the beginning. They soon turn into conformism and cheerism. Enthusiasm for the common effort is drowned up by propaganda geared to constantly

trigger the fear and then constantly re-emerge the slack and the weary. Bitterness floods people's faces and lives. Joyousness and playfulness become suspect. People are expected to smile a lot. Ashamed and afraid, they no longer look into one another's eyes and hearts. The enemy abroad has in a very true sense become the tyrannical ruler of everything human beings cherish.



I noted above that pain, rage and fear, all evoke nearly identical physiological and mental responses in the individual. Why should this be so? Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from the organism. It is apparent that all of these stimuli prepare us to be aggressive, that is, to strike out and to try to destroy that which is hurting, angering, or threatening us. That this is so in the case of rage is well known. Rage and frustration are closely linked and a whole school of psychology has spent much of 30 years describing the relationship between frustration and aggression. At a more direct level, we all know that rage makes us uncontrollable and ready to fight. That pain and threats also tend to cause aggression or 'lashing out' is less well known, however, or perhaps it is also well known but little considered by those who base social policy on the use of threats.

Or it may be that pain and threats are transformed into rage and frustration and that this is the mechanism whereby these stimuli evoke aggression. This also makes sense. Experiments show that rats given a painful electric shock attack and bite the bars from which it is received, giving every evidence of being enraged. And threats are, almost by definition, the promise to deny something which is treasured—even physical well-being. Such denials of desired goals fit the classical definition of frustration. So it may well be that the reason pain, rage and fear all make us react in the same elemental and primitive way is that at the physiological level they all boil down to much the same thing.

But if so, think what this implies for the use of threats in negotiations such as legal systems where they are always at least in the background, in a foreign policy such as 'containment' where they are very much in the foreground, or in nuclear deterrence where they dominate everything. It means, in the simplest form, that to be subject to such threats makes people mad, and when people get mad they are notorious for damned well not doing what is being demanded. They are also prone, as I have noted, not to think very clearly and to be full of fight. Now if the target of the threats is a small child, a business associate, a student or an employee, we can usually put up with his resentment and anger. If the target is, on the other hand, an already belligerent nation with nuclear equalizers of its own, we had best stand lightly. Our efforts to contain and control it may evoke just the opposite of the desired peaceful acquies-

science, and the stakes are oblique. Does America allow itself to be 'contained' as it so blandly says it is containing China? Does America quietly acquiesce to being 'detoured' by the Soviet Union or does it desperately try to elude their pressure with ABM systems and retaliatory counter-counter-threats? There is much talk handed about in military and quasi-military academic circles that U.S. deterrence threats can make the Soviet Union grudgingly accept an 'inferior status' or 'give up'—whatever that means. Did England give up under threats from Germany?

If we are incapable of learning from history it seems unlikely that we will be capable of learning from the behavioural sciences. Yet the evidence is abundant and clear if we would but look at it. Using threats to try to control the behaviour of another triggers off a whole constellation of responses which makes it very unlikely that we will get the behaviour desired. And even if in the short run we do, all kinds of other things happen which are almost certainly disastrous in their long-run consequences. Many deterrence theorists are aware of this and they talk little of 'long-term deterrence' and its effects on the nations involved. They know all too well that a fostered nationalism, self-righteousness, authoritarian rule, and widespread pathology on all sides. They argue rather for its usefulness in a crisis, citing the effectiveness of Khrushchev's rocket ranting over Suez in cooling the ardour of British and French in 1956, or they point to the effectiveness of Kennedy's rocket ranting over Cuba to cause the Soviets to bow and take their missiles home.

There is no question about it, you can sometimes make a man or a nation back down by threatening to beat the hell out of them if they don't do so and so—but it's a gamble. They often don't back down, and then there can be the devil to pay. When police flood a restless campus in Tokyo or Berkeley with arms, patrol cars, tear gas, helmets and clubs, the level of violence by the students doesn't dampen into youthful politeness and academic order, it escalates into rock throwing, building trashing, and defiant curses. When I was sixteen and my father laid down seven demands on my behaviour 'or else', I rebelliously and systematically ignored all his demands and the following day I left home. Few who stop to think seriously about it would question today the proposition that many of America's ill practices, much of her belligerent and aggressive nature, most of her oppressive policies, can be traced to the fact that for 40 years now she has felt severely threatened, first by the Axis powers, and then by the Soviet bloc and China and she, in turn, has become a prime threatener. The evidence is clear: *threats usually evoke the very behaviour they are designed to prevent.*

We know this, yet we so habitually ignore and deny it in our personal practices and national policies that it might illuminate our consciousness to think seriously about the mechanisms by which this occurs.

A moment ago I set down a bottle of beer on the desk beside me. Something in the way the light caught the bottle and surface of the desk, something in the sound as I set it down, made me believe that I had tilted it and it was falling over. In reflex I grabbed for the bottle, in the process hitting it with my knuckle and in fact knocking it spilling.

This is a 'self-fulfilling prophecy' built into the organism. A cue sets off a response in us. We react. The reaction creates the very condition we initially anticipated.

Such has been the situation of hatred and distrust between the major nations of the world, such is a more general sense is the nature of nearly all human interactions. Our beliefs about the world, our responses to what we think it is like, create that world in their image.

Our lives are sets of expectations born of our past experiences. From those expectations spring a new reality. We move in the world around us and we predict what we will find—sometimes warily testing, sometimes with full surety that there will be love—or anger—or hatred—or trust. We predict and so we act. Our actions breed the reality. To illustrate -

A mother, frustrated and furious with an obnoxious child, can find threat in a refuge from having to deal with the situation in a way which fully engages her emotions and other reactions. She will say, 'All right, that's it. If you do that one more time I am going to spank you. This is the third night this week you've said you were hungry and wanted to eat, then disappeared by the time I had supper ready. If you ever do that again I'm going to just stop fixing you food.' The child responds sullenly, and the event is over. It has been 'handled'. Now attention can be turned to something else. In reality, of course, the situation has not been solved at all—a has merely been postponed, tossed into another time for disposal. How much better it would be, it seems to me, if the mother could find a way to react in that moment with the fullness of her feelings of that moment—the anger, the betrayal, the feeling of being scorned and unloved, to respond to the child directly with those feelings instead of trying to shunt the problem off to another time with the mechanism of threat. And of course in the act of postponing the full reaction, she creates a situation in which, when it does happen again she has been made a victim of her previous threat—even though this time the situation may be a little different or her mood a lot different, and she isn't really very angry. Now she is trapped. Now she must either carry out the punishment which she doesn't feel at all like administering or she will no longer be believed by the child. Her statements and emotions won't be taken seriously and the relationship will deteriorate. Determinate theorists have written treatises and politicians have spoken volumes about how this same mechanism works at the international level. They call it 'maintaining credibility'. Bargaining theory formalizes it into complex

mathematical formulae. I call it self-entrapment. Our actions breed the reality.

Yet, we know something of how the interaction between two parties in a threat relationship causes the threat and fear level to escalate. But fear tends to escalate internally also. That is, an initial threat one seems to set off a low level of fear. Under some conditions, that fear will increase over time rather than decrease even in the absence of reinforcing cues. We would not expect this to be so, given our ordinary view that the effects of a stimulus decrease with the passage of time. So to understand why it is so we need to look at some psychological evidence which is well established but little used in most models of behaviour. It is this: *When an event is feared, preparations to cope with the event increase the conviction that it will indeed occur.* The greater the preparations, the greater the conviction. There are a number of carefully controlled studies which confirm this, but evidence is more readily at hand if we will but tap into what we all know upon reflection. The home-owner who worries about burglars and buys a bedside gun will thereafter worry more. If he moves into a 'hardened community', purchases a guard dog, a gun, extra locks, alarms, and hires a patrol service, his worry will turn into absolute conviction that robbers prow! everywhere. The police, who are prepared for crime with elaborate organisation and equipment, see its potential in every passing face. Similarly, a patient who watches cancer preparations for emergency as he enters the operating room will be more convinced that one is likely to occur. Occupation troops who make intricate plans for dealing with possible disturbances soon find themselves thinking in terms of certain riot and revolution. By the same token, the more of our national treasure and energy we spend to deal with internal disturbances or with possible nuclear attack (ABM, etc.) the more convinced we become that attack will take place. This is known to psychologists as a *spiral mechanism*.

It should now be clear that fear will tend to escalate as preparations are made to deal with it. What may have begun as a small, vague and uncertain threat one is transformed into a massive bogey as we try to master our resources to cope with it. At the individual level, this seems to be because we want to justify to ourselves our defensive sacrifices and the way to do this is to assure ourselves that they are really necessary. As we successfully do this then, fear increases with our increased certainty as to the reality and the magnitude of the threat. At the national level, a parallel process takes place, with the assurances of the reality of the threat taking the form, for instance, of military testimony before Congress or of Pentagon propaganda as to the severity of the threat being used to justify a new weapons system. And of course once the multi-billion dollar system has been created, then we've got to believe in the reality of the threat, else we've squandered all that work and money.

which could have been used for other things. The same thing happens when we've created the lives of our sons in a war. The enemy must be evil and the cause just. To believe otherwise is intolerable.

(It is the same psychological trap which allows psychiatrists, medical doctors, drug companies, and even liquor and perfume manufacturers to charge exorbitant fees with impunity. They know that people will be certain that something *that expensive* must be more valuable than if it were cheaper.)

The result of this mechanism? That which began as a possibility is now translated into a fearful certainty in our minds. Thus, of course, is the classic definition of paranoia.

### Conclusion

Not all animals respond to threats in the same way. Each reacts to threat according to his kind. The snake hisses or slinks silently off, the gazelle stampedes, the turtle shrinks into his armour, the bird takes flight. For each, evolutionary experience has added a typical fighting or fleeing motor response to the automatic physiological and mental changes triggered by threat. That is, not only does the body change instantaneously, but certain behaviour sequences seem to be activated in a way nearly as automatic. Whether these will be predominantly of the hiding, fleeing or fighting nature depends on the animal and upon the threat cut. For man, with his spectral heritage of fleeing safety in caves, behind fire and cliffs, and in the mutual aid of organized numbers, the behavioural sequence triggered by threats seems to be to retreat into fortifications, to find defensive weapons, and to submerge himself into the group. An overlay of changing culture on this unchanging animal gave us the walled cities of the early agricultural era, the feudal castles of the middle ages, the armed and disciplined nation and guarded communities of today. It explains our obsession with 'nuclear shields', 'hardened' weapons and homes, and consensus and patriotism. Each is the modern manifestation of a most primitive instinct. The 'increase in group cohesion as a function of external threat' so elaborately described and tested by contemporary social psychologists reflects nothing more than the response of half-sentient primates meaning to join their fellows in the cave when danger is sensed or the sailors of the surf who dropped his bee and shouted his women and babies to the castle when a dark cloud announced bandits.

But we human animals are not always such defensive creatures. Sometimes we become aggressors, we 'go on the warpath' and search out others to plunder. This is not odd. Most animals will be both defensive and aggressive on occasions. And when we have been the aggressor, we have always known that the reaction of our victim will be to fortify themselves, organize and fight back. Until recently at least.



Now significant action in the world seem to have forgotten this. For the assumptions of 'confrontation politics', 'law and order', 'containment', and 'deterrence' are—and this is wildly at variance with all we know about human behaviour—that when we confront, dominate, and threaten another group, they will meekly submit and change their ways to suit us.

Or do we really not believe this at all and merely hide behind the assertion as a smoke-screen covering the fact that our demands for more cops and guns, more fantastic military machinery, show that we are enamoured of weaponry, that what we really dream of doing is not controlling but destroying all those who dare to resist our will? Perhaps this is so. Perhaps all the rant about control and deterrence is nothing but an attempt to hide the fact that we are all—Parther, Pig and Preacher alike—entangled in a culture which has become pervaded with violence, destruction and death. Perhaps all the arguments are spurious, even to those who make them. Perhaps our glorious day as the gun as Homo Sapiens—the animal which reasons—is drawing to a close and we are beginning a lonesome march to the sea of our own bloody passions.

The apologist will argue that confrontation politics, law and order, containment or nuclear deterrence are not aggressive actions. This is nonsense. Each is an attempt by one group to bend another existing group to its will, whether the other wishes or not. The English language has always had a word for this. It is conquest. The ideological, legal and moral justifications are elaborate, loud, self-righteous, assuasive, contradictory and always self-serving. We have heard them for centuries and for centuries have known that they are just that—justifications. It is conquest. When shotgun armed Parthers take over a hall it is conquest. When three or four helmeted cops club a student into unconsciousness, it is conquest. When the United States incinerates a million Vietnamese from the air it is conquest. When the President delivers an ultimatum backed up by nuclear missiles it is conquest. It is not liberation or law and order or pacification or democracy. It is naked and brutal threat and violence and it is older than the species. But what may have worked to preserve the bare lives of simple primitives will not work to preserve the fabric of a complex society. Our threats and our violence are clothed in tear gas, fragmentation bombs and nuclear fire. Violence has become the handmaiden of extermination—not just for individuals, but for the species. Our threat society seems to have brought us to a dead end.

## *'Is your journey necessary?'*

---

ROGER FRANKLIN

Nobody is enriched by mechanized mobility. All our beloved cars, planes, ships, trucks, buses, moon-rockets and missiles, and even that environmentalist's pet, the railroads, are a danger to mankind, to all living things, and to the good earth itself. Unless we can cut these monsters of movement down to size, down to the non-polluting bicycle, sailing ship and canal barge, we are heading for doom, either by pollution, or by the exhaustion of resources.

Industrial man consumes and pollutes 25 to 50 times as fast as a simple peasant while crying alarm at the impossibility of feeding the hungry poor. Yet what people really need as food, clothing and shelter can vary by no more than a factor of two or three. All the excess consumption and pollution must derive from industrialization, from the use of powered machinery. This automatically makes a case for a neo-Luddite movement demanding control of the ravages of machinery. How much powered machinery can we consume to use if we are to preserve the environment for our children and their children?

If a third of the world's people are consuming, per capita, roughly 25 times the resources that the other two-thirds use to barely subsist, then the resources available, if properly distributed, could be giving a life of sufficiency—if not of luxury and waste—to everyone now living, and to those billions more who must come before we are able to defuse the population bomb.

"But there is a distribution problem, and yet you call for the stopping of mechanized transport?"

A distribution problem indeed there is, because what do we find all that transport burning up all that oil to move? When it is not rushing people around on all sorts of perverse and frivolous reasons, then it is sucking raw materials out of poor nations into rich nations, or hauling food from a degraded, mechanized countryside, where people might be

living and producing for local use, into the urban sprawls. (While those who cannot bear to remain too long in the polluted cities become commuters and add even more superfluous travel.)

Stop the transport, stop the rush-around mania, and what would happen? Hungry people would have to begin to move back to the countryside, to the source of food. And the land would start to be used properly again, with food grown intensively by people who would learn to get off their backides and harness the natural processes which, with adequate labour, can grow phenomenal quantities of food per acre without polluting chemicals and pesticides. This can be done and is being done in a few places, but it means work on essentials not frills, it means giving up dependence on a few primary producers and their polluting machinery who now operate so inefficiently (in terms of land use) and at such a high cost to the environment.

Properly organized, the work of local production for local use need not be arduous, and can certainly be more satisfying for all workers than the machine-minding routines now endured by so many.

Each car in the USA costs the average owner about \$1,500 annually to run, maintain and replace. Thus 160 million cars must be consuming \$150 billion worth of materials and services, or about a sixth of the dogmatical "Gross National Cost". This is more than is spent on the whole of the US food industry, which is itself grossly inflated in cost by excessive transporting, packaging, advertising, and the rest. If one adds in the aeroplanes (about four times the fuel per passenger mile of a full car) and 500 million passenger-miles of domestic flights every day, the trams, buses, and ships, the tankers hauling oil, the subsidies to roads, railways and airlines, as well as the cost of military mobility, it seems clear that more than half the *fringe* of activity in the USA—and the picture is similar in most industrial countries—can be attributed to mechanical mobility.<sup>1</sup>

Clearly, the actual value of any commodity remains unchanged when it is moved (unless it is reduced by damage in transit). So the need for all these ships, planes, trams and trucks (and for the packaging industry) arises only because raw materials have to be moved from where they occur to where we have decided to process them, and from there to where consumers have decided to live. The huge network of transportation has, of course, led to a remarkable degree of concentration and specialization in production, and to the ever-increasing use of machinery to replace muscle. It has helped in the production of a wide range of *artifacts*, but hardly essential "goods", so that those who are rich enough can purchase exotic products from the ends of the earth. Which might be well and good if we could afford it. But in ecological terms, and in view of the large majority of mankind who remain impoverished in the midst of this conspicuous consumption, we clearly

canon

It is instructive to inquire how much of the elaborate industrial machine that the transport system serves is, in fact, incessantly parsable: how many resources, how many vehicles, are used in just making and maintaining the transport system itself? In an article on 'Transportation' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1968), Prof. Robert E. Carlson writes 'From the advent of the industrial revolution in the western world, the trend was towards centralization and concentration of large-scale industries in certain locations. Specialists, producing only parts of the finished product, worked in scientifically managed plants often far removed from one another, with highways, railroads and waterways used to carry these products to centres where they were assembled. Hence, while Detroit, Mich., is recognized as the world's automobile capital, its preeminence is due in great measure to the US transportation system. Rubber products from Akron, O., electrical equipment from the East Coast, steel from Pittsburgh, Pa., and motors assembled in automated plants in Buffalo, NY, are shipped to Detroit.'

Compare this with the preceding passage in the same article: 'Prior to the Industrial Revolution, producers of goods (such as the blacksmith, cabinet-maker and leather worker) . . . drew necessary raw materials from the near vicinity, converted the raw materials into a finished product in their own shop, and sold the commodity to a nearby market. This forced each producer to be a general craftsman rather than a specialist; it limited the things he could make to readily available raw materials; it encouraged decentralization of industries into small-scale units. While this sometimes resulted in an infinite variety of beautiful, individualized products, it could hardly be called efficient.'

The overgrowth of canan did not begin with the automobile and truck, but started when the railroads and steamships made possible a supply of food and raw material (and labour) from an ever-expanding countryside—and ultimately from the ends of the earth. As Professor Carlson says, the process of machines feeding machines began quite early: 'Because newly industrialized nations had to feed substantial supplies of raw materials overseas to satisfy the insatiable appetite of the machine, fleets of ships having large capacities and fast speeds were required.'

So the whole grotesque 'megamachine', with its horrible alarm, its repetitive, mechanical work for millions, its threat to the environment, and its rush to automated annihilation as the 'megamachines' conflict, was made possible by the invention of ever faster and 'cheaper' means of transport—cheap in terms of human labour, which is all that has to be paid for in the short run, but terribly costly in terms of using up so many irreplaceable resources, and in making us entirely dependent on the high rate of use.

We are so immersed in an economic system designed for the benefit of the producers and salesmen that, provided customers can be found to pay the price, any increase in cost of production that results from an excessive use of machinery or of transportation is regarded as a contribution to the national wealth, and is tacked up as part of that shibboleth, the Gross National 'Product'.

This whole system has been allowed to develop because we sold out long ago to the traders and merchants and entrepreneurs. These 'middle men', who gained vast profits and power from imperialism set the pattern by which we now live, where 75 to 90 per cent of the price of most commodities used by most people is siphoned off by middle-men who move, package, store or sell the goods. This leaves a mere fraction for the primary producers, whether these are nearby farmers or far distant peons in banana, coffee and cocoa plantations overseas.

Clearly, we have scaled out industrial societies so that we are utterly dependent on mechanical transport. The majority live too far from work to walk or cycle. Many have moved from place to place so often that they would be cut off from friends and relatives without the use of cars, trains, buses and planes. Worse than this, our whole production system, as we have seen, has been geared to centralized mass production, with raw materials transported from great distances and the products re-distributed out again to huge market areas.

A sudden change, as every transport strike has shown, would produce chaos. But it is time at least to change direction. Resistance has begun already against the ultimate in rush-around madness, against airport noise, motorways, and against the SST (Concorde and ilk), which consume enormous quantities of fuel and produce localizable pollution effects. But now the time has come to revive the general slogan, used when rationality was enforced by war: 'Is your journey necessary?'

Those who are ecologically concerned should begin to minimize their own transport needs to seek work, entertainment and relaxation nearer home, to cultivate local friends, to try to improve the local environment so that mobile 'escape' becomes less necessary. Planners should include a maximum of travel in their designs for new living and working environments. But the real key is industry, the production processes themselves. By forms of preferential taxation it might be possible to 'penetrate' the worst ecological offenders—the users and makers of cars and planes—as is to force a rise in price that would begin to reflect the true ecological costs, the long-run costs, of our obsession for rushing around.

But if we are to move away from our present cult of speed and growth towards a new era of stability and more local living, we need more than government fiat. It will be a matter of gradual persuasion,

and increasing awareness. This will be helped by the increasing over-exploitation of the physical limits of the environment on our present extravagant and wasteful life cycle. Rising prices are not just a matter of mismanaged money, they reflect a real increase in costs, not only of formerly exploited labour, but of raw materials. In particular, fuel costs will continue to rise as convenient sources are used up. This increase will be reflected in the prices of all manufactured and transported products, including food. As prices rise, people will find it worth while to grow more of their own food, they will find the car and plane, and also trains and buses, too costly for frequent journeys, and they will use them less, and perhaps walk more, or bicycle, increasingly confining the greater part of their living to a small local area.

Much will depend on people's attitudes, and on how widely it is realised that we have, for the past half century, been living on ecological capital well beyond our sustained income. A battle for the environment, fought for the rights of our descendants, could yet become a new 'moral equivalent of war' (Indeed the wartime British slogan, such as 'Dig for Victory', apply as much in the fight for the environment as they did in the war.)

We don't have to stop everything, to go back to primitive, pioneer living without any scientifically developed amenities. But if we continue much longer without putting on the brakes, the system is going to collapse in chaos, and many will find they have no choice. But a plan-and-cut-back could work out differently.

In deciding what to retain and what to restrict, we must keep in mind the limits of sustained resources of energy, and of recycled materials. Sustained energy sources, such as hydro-electric, tidal, wind power, geo-thermal and the burning of wood, supply only about 5 per cent of our present energy, with further development possible on a limited scale. While solar energy for other than space heating remains but a hope, it seems reasonable, initially, to aim at supplementing the sustained resources with fossil fuels and possibly nuclear fuels (if the waste disposal is not too dangerous), to allow a total of about 20 per cent of the present rate of energy use that now takes place in industrialised nations. The use of other exhaustible resources might be cut back similarly, and full re-cycling undertaken for metals, glass, plastics and, via composting, all organic wastes.

What could be done with one-fifth of the power and resources we now use? It would be adequate for domestic lighting, cooking and economical heating, for refrigeration, postal communication and all forms of electric communications, and for the manufacture of simple, high quality, muscle-powered tools and machines (e.g. bicycles, sewing machines, looms). It would not run to extensive street lighting, space heating, air conditioning, mechanised agriculture and, in particular, to an excess of

mechanized mobility

Why do we so love to go fast? When we rush in a car, train or plane, we are passing by thousands of fascinating scenes too quickly for our senses to appreciate them. We can see more in walking a couple of miles than in flying a couple of thousand. What, then, is the lure of distant places? Once, when it was a courageous and arduous undertaking to reach them, and hence there was less cultural imperialism to wipe out differences, there was something exotic to discover. But for the tourist herds of today, the 'exotic' is ever more artificial, and a 'home away from home' seems the chief object of travel, made from climatic change.

There can be no objection to muscle-powered travel—walking, cycling—or to sailing ships, and these are capable of taking us anywhere we want to go, often less frequently than many of us have been accustomed of late. But because these ecologically sound means of travel would take longer, travel would again be more purposeful and interesting.

Speed itself has a well-known fascination. There is a component of primitive survival in speed too—the fastest predators get fed, the fastest prey escape. The same principle carries over into the sophisticated primitivism of mechanized warfare. But when, for no real purpose, these instincts are indulged beyond the physical projects of muscle-powered sports is the extravagant mechanized mobility of the highways and skyways of today, we have surely moved into a phase of gross perversion of our natural drives.

A life without 'speed' would not need to be dull. In fact, once we adjust to living more locally, we might develop a far finer culture than has arisen since the small city states of ancient Greece, and, later, those of the Renaissance.

We might reflect, as we cut back on our travel, on the actual limits of human association—the number of human contacts that can be made and maintained in the course of a lifetime. The fact that this can be measured in hundreds or thousands, rather than millions, should help remove any illusions of 'making something' that we might tend to feel when we can less easily make a number of random acquaintances in remote corners of the planet.

Finally, what of those hungry millions in poor countries? Does a transport cut-back mean they are to be sent no more aid? A careful look at what actually comes from and goes to these poor countries should quickly disillusion a realistic observer about the benefits of present trade and aid arrangements. The poor countries would be much better off if left to themselves, with nothing but technical suggestions proffered by well-wishers from the more 'advanced' areas of the world. Indeed, it was recently shown<sup>2</sup> that farmers in the mountains of New Guinea, by using an agricultural system that suits the local ecology,

are able to support as many people in adequate comfort on each square mile as can be supported by an advanced industrial economy. The difference is that, while our industrial, extractive economy may well devour its own base in less than a century, the people of New Guinea have an economy that can be sustained indefinitely. We may not have as much to teach such people as we sometimes like to believe.

Ivan Illich has frequently urged<sup>1</sup> that real development in Latin America be promoted by the firm imposition of a speed limit of eight to ten miles per hour on all mechanical vehicles. He points out that, in countries where fast vehicles are in daily use, 'the time people are obligated to spend travelling increases as the speed increases'. So we can save time by going slowly, and what is more important, we can save the global environment. Slowing down can also help the poorer peoples of the world because it would get the rich off their backs and so allow them to begin to provide properly for themselves in their own way, using their own resources and initiative.

---

□ *Coursey Free Press*, London.

1. Cf. *Scientific American*, September 1970. The article by Earl Cook on 'The Flow of Energy in an Industrial Society' assigns 30 per cent of energy use directly to transportation. The manufacture of vehicles must comprise a considerable part of another 15 per cent assigned to 'industry', and there is surely an ingredient of transportation in the 30 per cent attributed to 'household and commercial'.

2. By Roy A. Rappaport in *Scientific American*, September 1971.

3. E.g. in his speech at the conference of the Tróilund Centre for the Future of Man, London, 23 October 1971.



## *A poetic celebration of the Mahatma's martyrdom*

---

L. JEEUDASAN

THE 'MARTYRDOM OF GANDHI' by Cecília Marder is a masterpiece of modern poetry. Originally written in Portuguese by the Brazilian poet, it was translated into French by T.S. Eliot. The very fact that an author of Eliot's eminence undertook a rendering of the poem is, not to mention the subject matter, a tribute to the greatness of the work. It would seem that the qualities which attracted Eliot to the poem and which continue to attract the reader to it coincide. Let us try and elucidate them from an analysis of the poem itself.

The poem is sparked off by Brazilian newspaper reports of the death and funeral of Mahatma Gandhi. As the word unfolds the leaves of newspapers the poet reads in every corner the headline 'Murdered while blessing the people'. The news, as it were, burns into her poetic soul and produces the ashes and embers of this poem. 'Here the blue screens stop and also the winged horses. Here I renounce the gay flowers of my inner dream.'

Though it is thus an elegiac dirge in kind, yet as a modern poem and despite its classical restraint, it does not use the classical Miltonic line and order. Rather it rambles with the mind of the mourner, like the dirges one hears in a country-side funeral house of Tamil Nadu. It sheds off the classical impersonality and comes alive with all the personal warmth of someone on glowing embers. It strays into the past and the future. It falls into glorious reminiscences and frightful futuristic visions. The first reminiscence is of the yester-night, January 30, when, 'In the vast night I heard a sad cry, a pained voice bee-like. And waking up I searched for a place far away and unattainable. It was you, then, who sighed so freely in the little final blood? It was your distant bones, craved through by death, sounding like delicate bamboo at the steeping down of day? Les ossements sont des brutes, madame.' Gandhi's spiritual strength and saintly power, figured by the delicate bamboo, is

confronted with the brute force of the rest of mankind that killed him. Thus a contrast is created between 'man' and 'savants'

When she reads the papers on the 31st evening, the news reports carry her from a private and possibly inferior incident to public history, namely, the glorious days of the freedom struggle marked by the restless spirit and boycott of foreign goods (symbolically ashrined in the spinning wheel) and nonviolent resistance and prohibition peacefully symbolized by the tea of Dargajing.

The contrast of the glorious past with the mournful present evokes an apostrophe to the 'dark untouchables of the whole earth' who do not even know that they should cry. Very resonant words, allusion of Gandhi's own to Tagore in the Gandhi-Tagore controversy of the 'twenties, but enlarging upon them to embrace the dark untouchables not only of India, but of the whole earth: "You, Tagore, you sing as birds who are fed in the morning. But there are hungry birds that have no voice."

From the morning when the untouchable birds do not sing, the poet becomes self-conscious of her own time of the day. It is the time when the Brazilian evening newspapers of 31 January 1948 spread the headlines of the murder which people read with an astonished discovery of their own share in the sin and guilt. 'And the most blind of all carries a torch between his soul and his sight.' The sensitive reader should be able to detect in this fourth stanza an echo of the event on Calvary as found in Luke 23:48.

It is about five in the evening in Brazil—tea time. And having read the gruesome story, all (and they are thousands) at their tea cups (it is Dargajing-Indian tea) are asking the same questions about Gandhi: 'What did this man want? Why did this man come into the world?' Surely there was a great and almost final destiny and sense of purpose about him and his life. The answer is given in Gandhi's own words. "I am no more than the little earthen bowl fashioned by the Divine Potter. When he does not need me any more, He shall let me fall."

Then comes the poet's own personal comment and it is an apostrophe to the now dead Gandhi, who is very much alive to her. 'He has let you fall. Abruptly, abruptly.' The remaining three lines of this sixth stanza, with their veiled allusion to the bullet pierced side and the last drops of blood coming forth amid that last deathless utterance, 'He Rama' (O God) and adorning his shrouding shawl, completes and deepens the parallel between the scenes of Calvary and the town of Birla House.

While the poet goes on with her mournful meditation, the wind—it is cold—which blows from India Brandwards continues to carry the message of the gruesome deed, even as it fans the headlines into the horrified eyes of every Brazilian. That message is that of Gandhi's

whole life: the supremacy of love or nonviolence. Ahm, who has heeded his words? But all have their smoking guns in their pockets. Smoking, that is, after foolishly shooting at Gandhi: their violence is still fresh in their secret consciences. Gandhi alone is free from violence (guns) and from secret possessiveness (pockets)—the possessiveness or possession of violence. His very blood was nonviolent (unarmed to the veins) and will ever be free from violence, being now fixed (by death) in its nonviolence.

The wind (played upon here in the double sense of 'prana', as both life and the air which sustains life) absorbs the whole of Gandhi's life, which is the best part in the poet's own life. In this state of absorption with the universal life-principle there is no more nationality and national symbols and military uniforms. It is a state of peace. The body of Gandhi is set on the funeral pyre which the sighs of India's women set ablaze. And the waters of the Ganges will religiously kiss the ashes which then the sun will take from the Ganges into the very presence of God. The very material ashes are not lost before God. They are present with him, even the little goat, which perhaps causes tender memories in Gandhi when he speaks to God. Thus even God is appeased, with those tender memories and materials before him. Superficially speaking, the poet does not answer the question 'What will Gandhi tell God?' But her mind is clear. Gandhi speaks as an intercessor (for men) with God. The goat itself being taken as the poetic symbol for Gandhi before God, comparable to the lamb of the evangelist St John, the parallel to the Christian, whom despots flatter. The poet has hinted what Gandhi will say to God. What will be God's answer to Gandhi? The question is not answered until we come to the end of the poem.

Meanwhile the wind continues to blow the pages and headlines of the newspaper. The headlines next to the murder of Gandhi are about the Carnival (ao Rio de Janeiro and other places). As she reads them, she hears underneath the voices of lust and anger and the howling of the crowds echoing through all the male current flows of the city. The noise, lust and impurity contrast sharply with the quiet holiness of the slayer's death who bless their murderers even as they bleed. But may always tell the 'voice of concord'—those who are themselves the words of reconciliation. Thus they have also killed the last of them all—Gandhi—and returned it 'to the silence of the sky'. That is to say, they make God silent towards them. They silence him by turning a deaf ear to him.

In such a world—a world as unsteady as clouds and hopelessly violent where, poetically, the flowers of her trees are falling—the poet must feel frustrated and lonely as in a desert and must make a last appeal to even to come to the help of Gandhi in his lonely struggle.

The impassioned appeal returns the poet upon herself. The poem

is throughout a conscious act and the poet at this point becomes fully self-conscious of all that passes through her and as it were creates the poem—namely, a fellow-being with Gandhi which makes her expiate for herself the beauty and heroism of a surrender like his and makes her heart bleed to know that Gandhi's blood is spilled.

The 'word', however, takes everyone to where he belongs—to his own home, his heritage, crimes, civility, surprise, indifference and ridicule which are the diverse responses of men to Gandhi's life and death. As it keeps company with every reader, the word will also carry the ashes of saints who are the living flames of a dead humanity. With their passing away, darkness will cover the earth (note allusion to Matthew 27:45, Mark 15:33 and Luke 23:44) losing lose the forms of violence and consequent sorrow which Gandhi had checked, 'containing its dykes of peace'.

At long last comes the answer to the question 'What will God say to Gandhi?' God who has done enough with Gandhi, will tell him, echoing Gandhi's own words to the poet, 'Men are brutes, my son'. So he will abandon them to their own devices, to the cycle of births and deaths and the four ages, so that the original chaos of Kali Yuga, the dark age, may return. 'It is necessary to go back to the beginning', so that, repeating of this 'frenzied battle of eons', men may call for God and Gandhi and return to them. Until such times, God will close his eyes to men and their deeds. And the reason why he willed that Gandhi should be broken with violence is that 'there is no more mankind to have you at its service'—that is to say, that mankind may realize that it has turned brute and is mankind no more. It is these words of God that the wind is scattering in every direction of the globe, 'in the thousand tongues of fire', when it sprinkles the ashes of Gandhi's bones like so many roses.

The final stanza, with its migration of the Hindu and Christian theologues of history (which itself penetratingly into martyrdom) is not as dark, gloomy and desperate in its prospects for history as it perhaps seems at first sight. For there is the hint of the hope that presently through the death reflected on the martyr, mankind will realize its brutish condition of violence and will be converted to God, to Gandhi and to love (*ahimsa*). One might even read a Hindu theology into God's invocation of Gandhi in the poem as 'My son'. But potentially it is more fruitful to note that God's paradoxical words to Gandhi in the final stanza are the same as those that the poet hears from Gandhi's 'pained voice bird-like' in the first. Not only does this serve as an artistic literary device in the poem, but this device also implicitly affirms that the words of a satyagrahi (man of truth) are the very words of God.

We have analysed the poem. The analysis may explain why a poet of Eliot's calibre undertook a translation of Cedric Belfrage's work. Still

it may be necessary synthetically to restate the intrinsic literary worth of the poem which accounts for the translation.

*Martyrdom of Gandhi* is a modern imagist-symbolist poem where every image is a symbol, striking in the vividness of image and emotion, and moving by subtle associations and strong contrasts. As is evident from the direct and oblique quotations from Gandhi, the poet displays not mere emotive sympathy with him but intelligent familiarity with his life and works, as well as with Hindu life and lore. Thus there emerges from the fourteen or fifteen stanzas of the poem the soul of Gandhi as well as of the poet. The native device of the wind fuses fact and philosophy together, namely, the Christ-event and the Gandhi-event as specifically the same event of martyrdom, which is a reflection on the historic state and evolution of the martyr on the one hand, and on the historic regression of mankind on the other; namely, men becoming brutes. As the vehicle of a synthetic, Hindu-Christian philosophy, the poem is truly a creative work. At the same time, the factual device of the newspaper which the poet is reading keeps the philosophic ramifications down-to-earth and pertinent to the facts she is reading about. Finally, the poem itself is one of the 'thousand tongues of fire' in which the Pentecostal wind is scattering the paradoxical and challenging words of God: 'Men are brutes, my son'—words which register the poet's own shock at the news of Gandhi's death-words and which ought to shock the reader too out of his complacency about his own and the general human condition.

---

□ Text of poem omitted

# Martyrdom of Gandhiji

---

CECILIA MURIELLI

Here the blue doors stop and also the winged horses  
Here I remember the gay flowers of my inner dream.  
The newspapers are here unfolded in the wind, at every corner.  
"Murdered while blessing the people"

In the vast night I heard a sad cry, a pained voice bird-like.  
And waking up I searched for a place far away and unattainable  
It was you, then, who sighed so frailly, in the little final blood?  
It was your distant home, crossed through by death,  
Sounding like delicate bamboos at the stooping down of day?  
'Les hommes sont des brutes, madame.'

O days of resistance, the spinning-wheel weaving in every home,  
O Vande Mataram, in the small harmonium, among slices of gold.  
The tea of Darjeeling, milady, has the flavour of white roses.  
Streets, streets, streets, do you know who was killed there yonder on the  
other side of the world?

Dark unreachables of the whole earth! You do not even know that you  
should cry!

'You, Tagore, you sing as birds who are fed in the morning  
But there are hungry birds that have no voice.'

And the evening wind fans the better headlines. Men read  
They read with the eyes of children spelling fables. And walk along  
And we all walk along! And the most blind of all carries a torch  
between his soul and his sight.

Here too it is five o'clock. And I see your name among thousands of cups.

In the short smoke of the tea that nobody drinks.  
 'What did this man want?' 'Why did this man come into the world?'  
 —'I am no more than the little earthen bowl fashioned by the Divine Potter  
 When He does not need me any more, He shall let me fall.'

He has let you fall Abruptly, abruptly  
 There still remained inside a draught of blood  
 Your heart was not yet dry, hallowed phantoms,  
 Small cups over-blown in a sheet of foam, among sacred words

The evening wind comes and goes between India and Brazil, and is not  
 used  
 Above all, my brothers, non-violence  
 But all have their smoking guns in their pockets.  
 And you were, in truth, the only one without guns, without pockets,  
 without tea,  
 Unarmed to the veins, free from yesterday and the day of tomorrow.  
 'Les hommes sont des frères, madame'

The wind takes away your whole life, and the best part of mine,  
 Without flags, without uniforms Nothing has soul, in a crumbled  
 world  
 The women of India are bowed like bundles of agave  
 Your part is ablate The Ganga will take you far away,  
 Mindful of dust which the waters will closely keep.  
 And the sun take up from the waters, up to the infinite bench of God  
 'Les hommes sont des frères, madame'  
 What will you say to God, of the men that you have met?  
 A little goat, perhaps, will awake tender souvenirs

The wind blows the headlines, makes news about, men dance.  
 It is Carnival-time here now (And everywhere )  
 The voices of madams and the voices of lust stretch out vigorous bows.  
 The howling of the crowds echoes through the thousand levels of cement.

Saints die solemnly, blessing their murderers.  
 The last voice of deserted returns to the silence of the sky  
 The flowers of my toes are falling. I see a loneliness come to embrace  
 me  
 Clouds arrive, clouds, like burned symbols  
 The wind gathers the clouds, pushes troops of elephants  
 Fly, peoples, help the frail man who loved you!

Along my arms descends a surrender of beauty and browns.  
What currents were there between your heart and mine  
That my blood should suffer to know that yours is spilled?

The wind takes the men through the streets of their business, of their  
crimes.

It takes the surprise, the curiosity, the indifference, the laughter.  
It pushes everyone to his own home, and continues on its crusade.

The wind will blow quick flames, the wind will take light ashes.  
Afterwards there will be darkness And there will be much sorrow. At  
last those tears will flow,  
Those tears that you were holding back, containing in dykes of peace.

God will say to you 'Men are known, my son.  
We have tested enough. Let us turn them loose, so that they return to  
class, so that the ocean may boil.

So that they may go and return, and again go and return  
Come and see from these my palaces of bliss the furious battle of  
errors

It is necessary to go back to the beginning. I shall also close my eyes  
And that is why I ordered that you should be broken with violence  
There is no more mankind to have you at its service  
Breathe with me your last breath Until such times when we may open  
our eyes again,  
When men will call for us'

The wind is scattering the words of God in the thousand tongues of fire  
In the thousand roses of ashes of your old bones, Mahatma.

---

□ First published in India in *United India*, May-June 1948, and reproduced here with permission



# Approaches to nonviolent revolution

---

ROD OVERY

THERE ARE TWO RADICALLY DIFFERENT WAYS of looking at 'nonviolent revolution' and several different positions which might be accommodated under the label. It is a great big rag-bag of a concept. As a goal it sounds right and as a slogan it has flair. The danger, I fear, is that we'll begin to speak and act as if nonviolent revolution is the agreed pacifist goal, without being aware that we may be talking about different things and with some of us still not convinced that nonviolent revolution is a practical objective.

In a recent review article in *Peace News*, the nonviolent revolutionary was told, on the one hand jokingly, to be 'too busy making the revolution' to read a book. On the other hand, he was said to have the serious problem of formulating and implementing a coherent strategy of revolution.

Now a man who has not yet formulated a strategy cannot be busy implementing it. So I assume the person who is busy 'making the non-violent revolution' has no need of a strategy. Presumably he feels emotionally and morally that there must be a revolution and believes it must be made without violence because violence is wrong and seems always to betray its advocates. His would be a personal or subjective view of non-violent revolution.

The other view, that there is a serious problem to be faced in formulating and implementing a nonviolent revolution, suggests that a non-violent revolution may be a possible historical event if those who wish to see it will learn what are the conditions in which it could occur and then will act to make it happen. This view could have no built-in certainty, though it would probably be based on the faith that change can be made without violence. It is a more political view than the first, but could not be called an objective view of revolution until it could describe a politics of how the revolution will be made.

If we look at possible views of nonviolent revolution which could be developed from a personal ethical standpoint, I can distinguish three: the traditional pacifist, the Tolstoyan and the drop-out. In addition, there are three further views which are more political but which I would also classify as personal.

**PAFIST** The traditional pacifist view holds as its lowest common denominator that 'war will cease when men refuse to fight'. This could be called a revolutionary position because if everybody did renounce war then there would have to be a revolutionary transformation in our societies. The methods of pacifist persuasion—by means of conscientious objection, tax refusal, by the example of personal living and by other propaganda—have set war resisters firmly in the tradition of destruction against the state. The power of the pacifist's literalist interpretation of the Christian commandments, of Thoreau's concept of a counter-friction to the machine, or of Camus's defiant shout of 'I rebel', has however been limited in practice by a more stubborn refusal—the refusal of most men and women to question their governments in time of war. Quite how the situation will arrive when every man and woman voluntarily renounces war has not been made clear since Dick Sheppard's campaign for peace glides rim out of steam at the start of the Second World War. But a particular pacifist position which resolves the difficulty by asserting that the universal renunciation of pacifism is inevitable, seems worthy of separate consideration.

**TOLSTOY** Tolstoy thought that man's realization of his Christian error and an ensuing violence would come upon him inevitably and soon, as a result of the universal dissemination of Christ's teaching. Thus it would not be many years before the truth of human equality would burst from men's consciences and make the revolution on earth. This position seems to have been modified by Ronald Sampson, who uses Freudian ideas to show why men are often unable to respond to the truth which they know inside them. His analysis in *Equality and Power* shows that personal relationships of dominance and submission are at the heart of all the political edifice which crush mankind, and as a remedy he insists on the absolute value of human equality and truthfulness. I wholeheartedly agree with this—but none the less the Tolstoyan view loses much of its power if the revolutionary transformation to be wrought by truth is no longer inevitable.

**DROP-OUT** The drop-out view argues that straight society is corrupt beyond redemption and that if everybody goes and lives the good life in the best way he knows, then slowly the revolution will be made for lack of bodies to keep the system going. The principles—political, economic, ecological and social—from which such a decision is taken are often admirable, but that enough people will be able to sustain it to make a revolution just doesn't seem realistic to me.

Thus these three views, the traditional pacifist, the Tolstoyan and the drop-out, have the initial value of integrating the personal with the political. They combine both a personal view in favour of revolution and a political concept of how the revolution will be made: essentially by the example of direct action and by conversion. But the condition of their coherence as political concepts is the shaky one that everybody has to share the pacifist or Tolstoyan view, or a hugely significant number has to adopt the drop-out way of life. This strikes me as not possible of achievement simply by the methods of propagandising or of living exemplary pacifist, Tolstoyan or drop-out lives. That is why I would say these views have no strategy of revolution.

So at this point I am left as a personal pacifist, agreeing that a pacifist should integrate the values of his personal life into his politics, and the values of his politics into his personal life, but not convinced that this politics is strictly a revolutionary politics at all. It is simply a radical politics.

There are three further views which I would consider as most personal and ethical positions than coherent political strategies of revolution.

BALDWIN In his book *Social Anarchism*, Giovanni Baldini describes what he calls the social capital of a society, which is the sum of all the values which hold the society together. Within this, the 'ethical capital', a crucial concept for Baldini, is the aggregate of values consistent with an anarchist society which already exist in the pre-anarchist society. Baldini believes that much of the ethical capital of society has been taken over by government, in the form of the welfare state and other public services, and by industrial capitalism—but that these activities can be liberated from such unethical institutions by the determined activities of anarchist-minded people within them. On this issue, Baldini believes that an anarchist society might be achieved without a violent revolution. Thus he calls the 'anarchization of democracy'—and it might be called a nonviolent revolutionary position because it envisages a possible wholesale transformation of our societies without the use of violence.

The view seems to be similar to that of Paul Goodman, with his notion of the 'authentic professional' who truly looks to the interest of his client, and with his concept of the 'radical revolution' in education, economics, social behaviour, and so on. It is also consistent with Everett Ruess's 'struggle for a peaceful revolution' in the 'non-political institutions' of the school, outlined in his book *School is Good*. Ruess's proposals are based on an analysis of contradictions in the school system which, if they became obvious to large numbers of people who then were disillusioned with the institution of school itself, could lead to a revolution in education. From this Ruess believes there would be major political repercussions.

Ruess's is a coherent strategy of revolution for the sphere of

education, properly based on an assessment of the social dynamics which could make the revolution. It is a useful model, I would think, for non-violent revolutionaries. However, educational institutions are only one part of a larger system. Thus Renner's prescription, like Baldwin's and Goodman's, is for a radical politics rather than a revolution.

**HARRIS** A fifth position, which I would suggest is based on a personal ethic of nonviolent revolution, is one I associate with David Harris and the Institute for the Study of Nonviolence in California. Their emphasis, spelt out in Harris's book *Gandhi*, is both on a vision of the future which must be acted on now in your personal life-style and on the nonviolent process of making change which will inevitably define what you achieve. This is the revolution. You are the process which makes the revolution because the revolution is you. It is a minimalist and individualist view of great power, and is very close to Tolstoy's. In practice, these West Coast nonviolent revolutionaries concentrate on national and local issues which they invest with their particular brand of revolutionary content. But in the political sense—the second meaning from which I am considering the term—their position is not yet revolutionary because they have not worked out a strategy of making the nonviolent revolution a national and trans-national event. There seems to be simply a rhetorical updating and philosophical strengthening of radical pacifism, brilliantly concealed by the emphasis on nonviolent revolution as a process.

**STONER** A sixth position on nonviolent revolution was explained to me some time ago by Bob Stoner, an American Quaker direct actionist, who captained one of the Phoenix voyages to Vietnam, and he may have changed his mind since then. On his view, as I remember it, the revolution, if and when it comes, will inevitably be violent. What we can do, as nonviolent revolutionaries living in a pre-revolutionary period, is to stage dramatic, effective and highly-publicized direct actions, with the purpose of inserting nonviolent direct action as a revolutionary means into public consciousness. Then when the revolution comes, certain sections of the revolutionary populace may choose to use it. The view is certainly logical and perhaps the least self-deceptive in terms of revolution of any that I will consider. But it does not include the concept of nonviolent revolution as such. And it requires of the non-violent revolutionary that he be willing to engage in dangerous direct action protests for the whole of his life with doubtful hopes of success. It is not a life that I would care to live.

So these farther ways of looking at nonviolent revolution don't add up to a coherent political theory of revolution. Their emphasis is clear and sound in my view: We try to make the revolution through the medium of our own lives and out of this process emerges whatever revolution there will be. The key political insight which I would take from

these positions are as follows: first, what you achieve will be determined by your manner of living now, secondly, we should not be too politically ambitious and over-reach ourselves but be practical in what we try to achieve, and thirdly, the social institutions and political methods of a post-revolutionary society will largely be determined as the pre-revolutionary society. These views are consistent with a radical pacifist position but are not necessarily revolutionary. I think it may be that we cannot yet go beyond them.

If we turn to what I am calling political concepts of nonviolent revolution, there are three which I know of. The first is the anarcho-syndicalist view of a revolutionary general strike, and the other two are concepts of nonviolent revolution as developed by two American sociologists, Martin Oppenheimer and George Luker.

**SYNDICALISM.** I am especially skeptical of syndicalist views but I hope the following may be a satisfactory summary of the basic position. Workers under industrial capitalism are reduced to mere factors of production and progressively deprived of their human-ness. But the system contains within it the seeds of its own contradiction, which is that the mass of men and women, so deprived, are forced to organize in self-defense. They form industrial unions, the instruments through which eventually they liberate themselves by taking over the factories. A co-ordinated general strike, coupled with massive civil disobedience and nonviolent interventionary tactics, is the means of making a nonviolent political revolution.

This conception has the virtue that the social forms which will govern at least the economic life of society after the revolution have been evolved to virtual maturity before the revolution. Moreover, it may be reinforced by the Marxist dogma that such a culmination of the historical process is inevitable. However, 100 years after Marx, the inevitability of universal socialism seems to be wishful thinking, so also the faith in industrialism as the core process generating an equitable society seems very questionable. Such factors as increasing automation which reduces workers' power, the manipulation and control of workers as economic consumers by the media and other pressures, and ecological and political questions concerning the supply of raw materials for industrial processes, all incline me against this view.

**GUERRILLA.** Martin Oppenheimer, in his book *Urban Guerrilla*, confesses openly that there are not the virtues in American society which make a revolution there probable. On the contrary, he says, the American system functions so well that most social groups are opposed to change. This means that the nonviolent revolutionary guerrilla will have to provoke stresses in the society by tactics of intervention and disruption. Oppenheimer admits that the most likely outcome of such a strategy is a reactionary take-over of government by the extreme right.

On the other hand, if the nonviolent guerrillas led by some chance success, Oppenheimer fears that, as a minority in the population, they would have to consolidate their revolution by some new sort of bureaucratic class! So I can see no good reason for adopting Oppenheimer's strategy of nonviolent guerrilla revolution.

LAKES George Lakay's conception is altogether more impressive than this. Lakay has done most to popularize the concept of nonviolent revolution in Britain and has been instrumental in persuading War Resisters' International to proclaim it as a goal. He specifically rejects the elitist strategy of attempting to effect radical changes in the political structure before there has been a radical change in the consciousness of the people. Moreover, where there is no clink of armament and weakening forces likely to produce a revolution, Lakay proposes what Americans call 'newspaper-building'. His strategy of revolution is worked out at a generalized level as a trans-national model for use in any part of the world and as such it concentrates heavily on the organizational aspects of building a nonviolent revolutionary movement. His suggestion of five stages in the preparation for massive internal nonviolent conflict seems graphic and well thought out. The methods of non-cooperation, civil disobedience and nonviolent intervention are well known to readers.

The strategy does not do the work which such nonviolent revolutionary movement would have to do in its own country of making the specific social analysis of forces that will make the revolution. It is also important to notice that Lakay does admit that in some situations a series of what he calls 'revolutionary reforms' forced by mass non-cooperation might so shift the distribution of power and the basis of the economy as to make the take-over of governmental authority unnecessary.

However, I do not find myself convinced by Lakay's theory for two reasons. The first is his failure as yet to apply the revolutionary model to a particular situation. If I stick to apply it in a situation I know well, Northern Ireland, maybe this difficulty will become clearer.

As I would analyse it, at the start of the nonviolent struggle of the civil rights movement in the U.S. in late 1968, the situation was as follows: (i) a local struggle (ii) within a small political unit for (iii) a just cause (iv) which was achievable without affecting the vital interests of any major group (v) within a society that was tired of political violence. Three conditions seem to me to have provided a political context that was ripe for a major nonviolent social and political transformation—what Lakay would call a revolutionary reform. The problem, quite simply, was that the people engaged in the nonviolent struggle were ordinary working class citizens who in their daily lives meet violence at every point, often feel violent and sometimes are violent, and who, just below the surface, have a trademark of political violence. The campaign therefore needed a much slower build-up than it had, using educational work

shops, nonviolent training schools and the development of alternative nonviolent social and economic forms among the people, in order that the political conflict on the streets could be waged nonviolently over a sustained period. Otherwise the re-emergence of political violence was more or less inevitable.

None of this contradicts Lakay's strategy, as I understood it, but two further points need to be made. First, that to have said that one was a revolutionary of any description in the counter context of Northern Ireland would have been (and was) disastrous, because that implied that you wished to overthrow the state. The point is that a civil rights struggle had to be politically reformist if it was to succeed in persuading Protestant people, even if its methods might be revolutionary. This distinction between politically reformist aims and revolutionary methods is important. Secondly, because members of people engaged in the struggle had professions to become politically violent under provocation, it was essential that the campaign be organised by a leadership that was firmly committed to nonviolence, knew what it was doing, and was willing and able to hold the people back from violence. Now the leadership of the civil rights movement was willing but not competent to organise this sort of nonviolent struggle, and even if it had been, its role would have been objectively alien, because the consciousness of the leadership was in advance of the movement as a whole. This point is also important.

What the first point implies is that in a situation where there was a major, if local, nonviolent struggle, it would be a sheer abstraction to suggest that the use of nonviolent means was revolutionary. In that situation, the end contained in the means was reformist and therefore the use of nonviolence was merely radical. (It may be too big a jump in the argument to shift from Northern Ireland to the situation of nonviolent revolutionary groups in Britain—but I am left wondering how much more abstract and inappropriate it is to call the use of nonviolent action in Britain revolutionary when it is conducted at a far more mundane level in even more local struggles on less significant issues? A clearer picture is needed of the take-off factor in the British context which gives these local actions revolutionary potential.)

What the example of Northern Ireland also suggests is that, in the context of a real and immediate struggle involving working class people in the use of nonviolent action, it may not be possible to develop wholly democratic methods of decision-making. The existing leadership may have to use its position of concern in order to hold back the people from taking precipitate action. Yet this means, again, that the campaign is not truly revolutionary but merely radical.

I myself believe that a successful nonviolent struggle for civil rights could, and should, have been waged in Northern Ireland along the lines

outlined above—and that this would have had scarcely imaginable social and political benefits for the people. However, this struggle would not have been a revolutionary one, but reformist in aim and radical in method.

My other difficulty with Luker's position is a bit complicated. If I understand what he is doing correctly, he is asking pacifists to make a very real conceptual leap in their thinking. Instead of taking nonviolence and making it both means and end (as the first group of theorists I considered mostly do), he appears to take revolution as the end and then try to see how this can be revolution. This requires not only that the emphasis on alternative institutions be developed, but also that it be shown how these nonviolent social forms can begin to flourish and grow within the contradictions of the old society, and how they can then go on to sustain themselves and continue to grow without losing their dynamic as a political force. We need a social and economic theory of nonviolent revolution.

In the meantime, the syndicalist position, with its emphasis on revolutionary trade unions as the alternative institution which grows out of the contradictions in capitalism, seems to be the only one I have considered which presents a coherent theory of nonviolent revolution. But I happen not to be convinced by it. So I remain sympathetic to the effort to develop a new concept of nonviolent revolution, but a bit wary of people who are already talking and acting as if it has been given to us. We still have to make the theory of nonviolent revolution.

To list some of the activists and thinkers whose work may be relevant to this task: there is the social and political theory of Gandhi and Vinoba Bhave in India, the mutual aid anarchism of Kropotkin, the creative disorder of the Protest and Rebellion in the Netherlands; the post-anarchy social change theories of Murray Bookchin, the anarchist pacifism of Dave Dellinger, the work of Dom Helder Camara and Juan Gomez in Latin America; the economic theories of Ralph Borsodi, Leopold Kohr, E.F. Schumacher and Edward Mahan, and the achievements of Lanza del Vasto in France and Danilo Goto in Sicily. To this one might add, the community development theories of Saul Alinsky, the educational theories of A.S. Noll, Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich, the management theories of Donald Schon, the ecological planning of Ian McHarg, and so on. . . . If there is the man or woman or group of people who can produce the great synthesis which will be the theory of nonviolent revolution, will they please get on with it!

None of these more seriously concerned to developing the political theory of nonviolent revolution believes that this task has been completed. But it is more amusing to call yourself a nonviolent revolutionary than it is to call yourself a pacifist—and I fear that the image of nonviolent revolution is catching on faster than an awareness of the difficulties



with the concept. Those out already 'making the nonviolent revolution' almost certainly do not know how the revolution will be made and may be easily confused and disillusioned before long. That is, unless they hold firmly to a position on nonviolent revolution which is personally and ethically based and therefore not, in the more political sense, a non-violent revolutionary position at all.

Barbara Deming recently wrote that a definition of revolution could be 'The anger that is determination to bring about change'. But that is not a revolution, though it may be revolutionism. What I am saying is that we should regard this new pacifist enthusiasm for revolution with some caution.

---

(1) *Courtesy Peace News*, London.

# Some characteristics of Gandhi's thought

I. L. MALHOTRA

THOUGHT AND LIFE GANDHI WAS ENGAGED IN THE unending search for truth as it manifested itself in social life. His quest, therefore, determined the character of his thought. The truth that he sought was not a static but a dynamic entity which 'endlessly continued to unfold its myriad facets'. He moved consistently from 'truth to truth', from one state of consciousness to another, from a lower to a higher view of reality. So it was that he called the story of his life 'My Experiments with Truth'. It reveals the momentary endeavour of man to comprehend reality by the gradual process of observation and reflection, trial and error. His ideas, therefore, show a steady evolution. This means that his views on any subject must be studied in the process of its growth. It would be an error, as Ramsay Holland warns us, to attempt to judge him by whatever he said 'ten years ago'.<sup>1</sup> Gandhi himself advised his friends and critics that they would do well to take the meaning that his latest writing might yield whenever they were faced with any seeming inconsistency in his thought.<sup>2</sup> Only the study of his whole life and work can furnish us with a key to the correct understanding of his thought. For instance, we cannot have a correct assessment of his thought if we simply rely on his well-known work, *Hand Spinner*, written in 1908 and which contains a scathing attack on modern industrial civilization and all its appurtenances, such as machinery, railways, hospitals etc. It is true that he did not like to make any substantial change in the book even as late as 1935. But his views, as noticed by his secretary Mahadev Desai, had by then gone through the necessary evolution.<sup>3</sup> In *Hand Spinner* Gandhi stated that he did not find any good in the use of machinery.<sup>4</sup> But by 1924, he had come to regard only the crime for machinery as bad.<sup>5</sup> It was good if it was used as a vehicle for the expression of the spirit in man and not as an instrument of man's greed. It means that machinery is bad only if its use strengthens the habits of

man or results in the exploitation of man by man.<sup>4</sup>

Further, an analysis of Gandhi's attack on industrial civilization shows that it was directed mostly against the evils to which it was subjected at that time and which had already been highlighted by some of his celebrated European contemporaries. For instance, he says in *My Experiments with Truth*: "This civilization is wickedness and it has taken such a hold on the people in Europe that those who are in it appear to be half mad. They lack real physical strength or courage. They keep up their energy by intoxication. . . . Women, who should be queens of household, wander in the streets or they slave away in factories."<sup>5</sup> In correspondence with this outlook, he told a student from Santalban in 1924, that what he was against was the abuse of machinery.<sup>6</sup> So there is some weight in M.K. Bose's observation that at that time the industrial civilization was mixed up with capitalism in Gandhi's thinking.<sup>7</sup> Very few, of course, could distinguish between capitalism and the industrial civilization in the West at that time, for nowhere had any effort been made to put the new means of production in the service of the common man. But with the rise of socialism, industrialism has assumed a new role and many men, both in Europe and Asia, visualize an industrial society free from all its present evils. Gandhi, too, recognized the relative value of industrialism as modified by socialism.<sup>8</sup> But we would be going too far if we accepted Bose's conclusion that Gandhi's indictment was only against the capitalist form of production and not against industrialism as such.<sup>9</sup> True, he could recognize himself in the conscience of heavy industry in certain spheres of production provided that it was nationalized. But, basically, he had no fascination for mass production and centralization which are the necessary ingredients of modern industrialism.

But our discussion raises another question: 'Why did Gandhi not revise *My Experiments* if his ideas had undergone some change?' The answer involves another characteristic of Gandhi's thought. Gandhi had the knack of infusing new meaning into old words. Through this method he had pressed the ideals of ancient Indian culture to the service of modern man without altering their nomenclature. To a superficial reader Gandhi may appear a convertant on account of the frequent use that he made of traditional Hindu concepts such as *satya*, *ahimsa*, *aparigraha*, *Ramrajya*, *arjuna* etc. But as pointed out by Jomo Bhoderank, Gandhi used the traditional to promote the novel.<sup>10</sup> "He reinterpreted tradition in such a way that revolutionary ideas, clothed in familiar expression, were readily adopted and employed towards revolutionary ends."<sup>11</sup> Unconsciously he was following the ancient Indian method of adjusting old ideas to new conditions by reinterpretation. It is this approach that gave rise to the several schools of Vedanta in the past as the Hindus faced diverse situations in the long course of their history.

So Gandhi created old words, altered by him earlier or passed on to him by tradition, with new meanings. One may question the merit of this method on the ground that it leads to ambiguities in one's thought.<sup>11</sup> But words do change their colour when a man moves from one state of consciousness to another. This ambiguity can be overcome by following him in the process of his growth and by keeping in view the meaning that he attaches to a word at different times.

Again, Gandhi's effort to transform society in the light of his progressive awareness of truth linked his thought-process to the situation that he handled and the problem that he faced, for Gandhi was not an arm-chair philosopher. He did not sit down to prepare a systematic treatise of his thought. He was a man of action. Each situation draws out of him his vision of a particular aspect of truth seeking expression through social life. His right view of social life will emerge when each statement made by him on a particular subject is examined in the light of the situation that prompted the statement, as well as the whole mission of his life. Severed from the context, his statement may leave with us a wrong picture of his position with regard to a particular subject. To illustrate Gandhi once said, 'True democracy is not inconsistent with a few persons representing the spirit, the hope and the aspiration of those whom they claim to represent'.<sup>12</sup> Nehru gave in this approach a metaphysical view of democracy and he linked it to the communist conception, where 'a few communists', according to him, would claim to represent the real needs and desires of the masses, even though the latter may themselves be unaware of them. The mass will become a metaphysical conception with them, and it is this that they claim to represent'.<sup>13</sup> But read in its proper context, Gandhi's statement gives a different impression to others. He made the statement in support of his plea for reducing the number of delegates to Congress sessions from the existing 6000 to 1000, that is, one delegate for every one thousand voters; for him, according to Gandhi, was not the true test of democracy.<sup>14</sup> He proposed the amendment of the constitution of the Indian National Congress in order to do away with the unwieldy character of the organization. Such proposals are not inconsistent with the operation of the western mechanism of democracy. Here I may say that I am not suggesting that Nehru was unaware of the situation in which this statement was made by Gandhi. Nor do I intend to discuss here the implications of some of Gandhi's observations made on the working of democracy in the West in support of his resolution. Nevertheless, it is likely that a student of Gandhian thought may form a different impression of Gandhi's position with regard to democracy if he knows the situational context of this statement and studies it in the light of the whole experience of Gandhi about the working and value of democracy.

Further, the awareness of the context is also important in the study

of Gandhi's thought on account of the peculiar nature of his public life. All through his public life he was so intensely observed that there hardly remained any distinction between public and private life. Even remarks uttered casually or at weak moments did not go unnoticed. Narrating his experience of Gandhi's life, Reginald Reynolds observed: "With Bapu I soon realised that nothing he did was unobserved and very little that was observed was unrecorded. Can we wonder if we find unparallelled when even momentary weakness or forgetfulness was faithfully placed upon record?"<sup>18</sup> Moreover, it was not unusual for him even to lay bare the dialectical process through which his mind was passing before arriving at the solution of a problem. Some remarks were often made to clear up his own mind. If it is so, do we do justice to him if we simply rely on an isolated statement or a chance utterance made by him while putting an interpretation upon his thought? It may be said that any person can present Gandhi in any colour or shade by selecting excerpts from Gandhi's anthologies. Reginald Reynolds observed that immediately after the death of Gandhi some 'revisionists' attempted to modify the lessons of his life by stringing upon isolated sayings of Gandhi.<sup>19</sup> T. K. Mahabalan has rightly observed that the rapid decline, especially in India, of the academic acceptance of Gandhi is due to an error in interpretation which follows 'primarily from the unscholarly dependence of Indian intellectuals on Gandhi's anthologies'.<sup>20</sup>

Again, the riddle of inconsistency in his thought may be solved if we keep in view the fact that quite often Gandhi gave two solutions of a problem, one applicable to an ideal situation and the other to a situation in which the group finds itself at any given time. The former is unusual in application and the latter bears only a relative significance. The ideal solution presupposes a state of perfection, like Euclid's straight line, which can never be fully realized but which serves as a criterion for measuring man's progress. The practical solution is a concession to man's imperfection, and since the level of imperfection varies from man to man and group to group at different times, the nature of a practical solution and its distance from the ideal changes accordingly. The ideal and the real in Gandhi are not so separated from each other as to justify the concept of 'Two Gandhis'. He is not a bundle of diametrically opposed tendencies. There is a dynamic relationship between the ideal and the real in him which Gandhi summed up as 'practical idealism'. It means that a practical idealist should pursue the ideal to the extent the given situation allows. It is this consciousness of the actual that made Gandhi give solutions which appear to some of us as involving modifications of the ideal. The point can be illustrated by the positions that he took from time to time in applying the principle of nonviolence to different situations.

His faith in nonviolence was rooted in his belief in the unity of life

that followed from his adherence to the Vedantic principle of the indwelling of the same spirit in all living beings. It implies that causing injury to any living being is tantamount to the violation of the truth of our being. But Gandhi sometimes did recommend solutions that involved the painful task of inflicting injury on living beings. Thus in the course of explaining the propriety of his participation in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu Rebellion and the First World War, Gandhi argued that his action did not constitute a lapse from ahimsa as understood by him at that time. To illustrate his point, he contemplated a situation in which the menace of monkeys to crops sometimes compels even a votary of non-violence to inflict injury on them. Gandhi argued that as a believer in the sacredness of all life it is a breach of ahimsa to inflict injury on the monkeys. But so long as he is not able to find a way of saving the crops without inflicting injury on them, he may decide to do so since he cannot think of a society where there is no agriculture.<sup>21</sup>

Similarly he wrote: 'While I should not take any direct part in any war, I can conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it. For I know that all members [of society] do not believe in nonviolence to the extent I do. It is not possible to make a person or a society nonviolent by compulsion.'<sup>22</sup>

Likewise, his advice to the soldiers sent by the Indian Government to defend Kashmir against the attack of Pakistan terrorists in 1947, squares well with this approach to nonviolence. Gandhi said that he 'would not shed a tear if the little Union force was wiped out, like the Spartans, bravely defending Kashmir'.<sup>23</sup> These words shocked some of his admirers, for Gandhi had advised the British people during the Second World War that they should not fight Hitler but oppose him by nonviolence and spiritual force. Gandhi argued that his advice to the soldiers of the Indian Government was in no way a lapse from the creed of nonviolence. What he said was that 'he had no influence in the matter over his friends in the Union Cabinet'. He held on to his views on nonviolence as firmly as ever, but he would not impose his views on his friends, as they were, in the Cabinet.<sup>24</sup> He suggested that if the Union Government had not enough faith in nonviolence, it was better for it to use violence than to submit to the ruthless invader, for in Gandhi's scale of values violence was preferable to cowardice, though nonviolence was superior to violence. Moreover, his adherence to nonviolence did not prevent him from giving credit where it was due, even though the creditor was a believer in violence.<sup>25</sup>

This approach to nonviolence stipulates that nonviolent solutions cannot be imposed on a society which has neither any faith in nonviolence nor any training for nonviolent action.<sup>26</sup> This means that the extent to which a group can practise nonviolence depends upon the spiritual level of its members and their capacity for suffering. Many of the doubts

about Gandhi's position with regard to his pursuit of nonviolence would disappear if we kept in view the way he tried to give shape to the ideal in the light of existing realities. But it is not suggested that all his actions or statements can be justified on the basis of this approach. Some of the adherents of nonviolence, like Reginald Reynolds, may still object to his statement characterizing Polish resistance to the German invasion as 'almost nonviolent'.<sup>17</sup> Others may find his advice to the British to resist Hitler by spiritual force irreconcilable with the general position that he maintained with regard to the pursuit of nonviolence. But the right approach to Gandhi's thought does not involve us in any commitment or undertaking to defend every statement that he made. A systematic study of Gandhi does not mean that we start with the assumption that he was a system-maker and, therefore, that there was a logical consistency in all his statements. We only insist that before pronouncing any judgement on the validity or value of his views on any subject we should first try to understand the way his mind worked.

1. *Mandela, The Spirit's Pilgrimage* (London: Longmans Green, 1962) p. 148.
2. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mohandas* (New Delhi: Publications Division, 1962) vol. v, p. 168.
3. M.K. Gandhi, *Autobiography* (Ahmedabad: Navrang Publishing House, 1961) p. 5.
4. M.K. Gandhi, *Op. cit.*, p. 76.
5. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 161. 6. *Ibid.*
7. M.K. Gandhi, *Op. cit.*, p. 37. 8. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 162.
9. Harpal Kumar Bhas and P.H. Parashar, *Gandhi in Indian Politics* (Bombay: Lalit Publishing House, 1967) p. 11.
10. S. Radhakrishnan, *Mohandas Gandhi: Essays and Reflections* (Bombay: Janta Publishing House, 1955) p. 265.
11. Harpal Kumar Bhas, *Op. cit.*
12. Jean A. Boucher, *Concept of Mohandas* (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1958) p. 105.
13. *Ibid.* 14. *Mohandas Autobiography*, p. 72.
15. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 308.
16. *Mohandas*, *Op. cit.*, p. 211.
17. D.G. Tendulkar, *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 321.
18. Reginald Reynolds, *To Live as Hindus* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1951) p. 19.
19. Reginald Reynolds, *Op. cit.*, p. 121.
20. T.K. Mahadevan, 'An Approach to the Study of Gandhi' in *Gandhi*, vol. 1, edited by H.N. Ranjan Ray (Calcutta: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1962) p. 45.
21. *Young India*, 13/8 1932. 22. *Ibid.*
23. M.K. Gandhi, *Autobiography* (Ahmedabad: Navrang Publishing House, 1961) p. 127.
24. *Ibid.* p. 144. 25. *Ibid.*
26. *Pyarelal, The Last Phase*, vol. v, pp. 361-362; also, M.K. Bhas, *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.
27. Reginald Reynolds, *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

# *Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—II*

THOMAS HYELOP

WHO WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST, BORN OF THE VIRGIN  
MARY.

A FAMOUS NINETEENTH CENTURY HINDU WAS Ramakrishna, who was a priest of the Kali Temple at Dakshineswar, a village situated on the Ganges, some four miles north of Calcutta. Born in 1836 and dying fifty years afterwards, he has acquired many followers throughout the world, the late Aldous Huxley having been one of them.

'The story of Ramakrishna Paramahansa's life', Gandhi maintained, writing a Foreword to a biography of the sect, 'is a story of religion in practice. His life enables us to see God face to face. No one can read the story of his life without being convinced that God alone is real and that all else is an illusion. Ramakrishna is a living embodiment of godliness. His sayings are not those of a mere learned man but they are pages from the Book of Life. They are revelations of his own experiences. They therefore leave on the reader an impression which he cannot erase. In this age of scepticism Ramakrishna presents an example of a bright and living faith which gives solace to thousands of men and women who would otherwise have remained without spiritual light. Ramakrishna's life was an object lesson in stages. His love knew no limits geographical or otherwise. May his divine love be an inspiration to all who read the following pages.'

Ramakrishna's latest biographer is another English man of letters, Christopher Isherwood, who, like Aldous Huxley, migrated to America. He has been a devotee of the Ramakrishna Order, translated into English the *Angerashras* and two other Hindu scriptures. He is thus an intellectual not incapable of infusing alleged facts.

Ramakrishna's parents, Khadram Chattopadhyaya and Chandra Devi, both of them pious and visionary, were married in 1799. Before



Ramakrishna made his appearance, they had already begotten three other children, two sons and a daughter, and, after the first saw the light of day, a second daughter was born. Ramakrishna came into the world as Kamarpukur, a village in Bengal, and the circumstances of the event are said to have been as follows. In 1836 Khadram, then aged 20½, made a pilgrimage to Gaya, where a supposed imprint of the feet of the god, Vishnu, can be seen, and, while he was at this much frequented sacred place, Vishnu himself, visible to Khadram in a dream, promised soon to be born as his son. At about the same time Chandra Devi, who had remained at home, also had a dream. She dreamed that she was possessed by the divine and a few days later, while standing wide awake before the temple situated opposite her cottage, she had a completely overwhelming experience. The image of the god, Shiva, came to life before her eyes and a ray of light entered her. She fainted and, when she regained consciousness, discovered that she had conceived. The husband, on his return, found his wife transfigured and was of course interested to hear the news. Chandra, who was forty-five, now had, until the babe was delivered, almost daily visions of gods and goddesses and the name, Gadadhar, by which Ramakrishna was at first known, means the Master of the Mass, an epithet applied to Vishnu.

Although this story was deemed to be legendary by Romain Rolland and Max Mueller, two of Ramakrishna's western admirers, its truth was vouched for, as Christopher Isherwood pointed out with considerable emphasis, by all the seer's original disciples, people who, being deeply religious, regarded lying as a great obstacle to one's spiritual progress. Isherwood has further reminded us that the leader of those disciples, Vivekananda, who was not only very sceptical by nature, but also had received a western, agnostic education in Calcutta, was not the man to believe a tale on insufficient evidence. It is therefore impossible, according to Isherwood, to accuse the first followers of spreading a falsehood.

When I came across this oriental story of a more or less modern miraculous conception, I was not a little impressed. Personally I am persuaded that, if the story is true, the Christmas narrative is hardly incredible. Nor would appear to be the claim that the Lord Krishna and the Lord Buddha were similarly conceived. It is not inappropriate that a religious genre should be miraculously born.

Arthur Oberon wrote a biography, which has a Foreword by the philosopher statesman, Dr S. Radhakrishnan, until recently President of the Republic of India, of Ramana Maharshi, another seer of renown, who was living in southern India between 1879 and 1950. On perusing the work, I noted that, precisely as Ramana died, an enormous star slowly trailed across the sky. I noted that many saw this heavenly body and felt what it portended. Then I was inevitably reminded of the star

of Bethlehem.

Remember that, according to the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church, not only had Jesus no maternal father but also, after he had been born, Mary continued to be, what she ever remained, a virgin. It is therefore suggested by members of these two organisations that James, the Lord's brother, was James the Less, a first cousin of Jesus, near kinsfolk having been frequently described by the ancient Jews as brothers and sisters.

On the other hand Gandhi, like his fellow worker and very great friend, the English underconversional Christian, C F Andrews, who was an Anglican priest, did not accept the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus the Christ. 'I should find it hard to believe', he avowed, 'in the literal meaning of the verses relating to the immaculate conception of Jesus. Nor would it deepen my regard for Jesus if I gave those verses their literal meaning. This does not mean that the writers of the Gospels were untruthful persons. They wrote in a mood of exaltation.'

If you too cannot subscribe to this belief, you can tell yourself that the Greek word, *parthenos*, which is translated as virgin, actually signifies a mature young woman and therefore that you do not necessarily imply, when you utter this clause, that you think the birth of Jesus to have been in any way extraordinary. You can also point out that the phrase, by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, is not to be found in the original version of the Nicene Creed.

Every birth can of course be described as the work of the Spirit of God.

STAYING UNDER PONTIUS PILATE, WAS CRUCIFIED, DEAD, AND  
BURIED, HE DESCENDED INTO HELL;

Pontius Pilate, who, while the trial of Jesus was in progress, seems to have had sympathy for the accused, was doubtless not altogether a bad man, but nevertheless, the tool of a system. This Roman curator, as well known throughout Christendom down the centuries, inevitably symbolises the state, despotism, a ruling class, imperialism, pride, snobbery, class distinction, apartheid, all of which the Mahatma, a non-violent anarchist, an advocate of decentralisation, felt to be an unmitigated evil and therefore wanted to see liquidated. Gandhi maintained that, if every individual would strive to become a perfect servant, there would be no further need for nations to be highly organised as states and, pointing out that, when power is wielded by the few, it corrupts both them and the governed, he recommended a stateless democracy.

His constructive program was as follows: Within a nation there should be small communities, each as far as practicable managing its own affairs. In India, where there are seven hundred thousand villages,

every village should be looked after by a council of five, a *panchayat*, which, elected annually by all adults, should be regarded as the legislature, judiciary and executive of the place. The villagers, acting cooperatively and as a family, should produce their own food, clothing, milk, soap, paper, matches, electricity, sanitation, water supply and other necessities. They should have their own places of worship, playground, school and public hall. Handicrafts should be learned and women emancipated.

For purposes of mutual interest each village republic should be loosely federated. Therefore, the *panchayats* of a district should elect a district administration, district administrations should elect provincial administrations and these last should elect a central government, but there should always be the largest measure possible of local autonomy. Thus would the individual, inwardly ruling himself and eager to be of service to others, enjoy the maximum of personal freedom.

Because condemning centralization, the *Misistras* naturally disliked large cities and, although this aversion seems common to most westerners, many famous thinkers, Plato among them, have advocated small communities and these last should elect a central government, but there should always be the largest measure possible of local autonomy. Thus would the individual, inwardly ruling himself and eager to be of service to others, enjoy the maximum of personal freedom.

Because condemning centralization, the *Misistras* naturally disliked large cities and, although this aversion seems common to most westerners, many famous thinkers, Plato among them, have advocated small communities and these last should elect a central government, but there should always be the largest measure possible of local autonomy. Thus would the individual, inwardly ruling himself and eager to be of service to others, enjoy the maximum of personal freedom.

'Experience shows', wrote Aristotle, 'that a populous city can seldom, if ever, be properly governed. Well-governed cities have a limited population.'

'Cities are', Rousseau averred, 'the abyss of the human species. At the end of a few generations in them races perish or degenerate and it is necessary to renew them. This renewal always comes from the country.'

'When we get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe', wrote Thomas Jefferson in America in 1777, 'we shall become as corrupt as Europe.'

'Fifty thousand people gathered in a single place', Lewis Mumford maintained in his book, *The Culture of Cities*, 'can do fewer things together than twenty-five groups of two thousand.' 'Discussions lose words', he further pointed out, 'and seek to provide bigger areas and architectures for them, the bigger the crowd, the emptier their function.' Finally remember what, when he was delivering his North Lectures, Bertrand Russell said. The dearth of art and prophecy in the present age 'is the inevitable result', he proclaimed, 'of the fact that society is centralized and organized to such a degree that individual initiative is reduced to a minimum.'

I noticed that, while addressing the British Association in Leeds in 1963, the industrial economist, Professor Philip Florence, offered for our benefit a most timely warning. He asserted that, if such conurbations as London and Manchester, Birmingham and the Black Country,

Marseyade and Clydeade, Leeds and Bradford continue to grow unplanned with the current rapidity, we will have on this island by 2000 A.D. a complete nightmare of sprawling town areas, jammed roads and wretched countryside, the congestion being not only frightful, but also extremely expensive.<sup>1</sup>

Although Gandhi definitely condemned the industrial revolution, he was not against machinery as such. What he objected to was mass production, the profit motive, the control of goods and raw materials, the creation of slums, the throwing of peasants out of work, the concentration of production and distribution in the hands of the few. He fully realized that there must be a certain amount of industrialization, but he hoped that, as far as possible, tools and machines would be made for the small, rural community. He maintained that the wealth of a nation should be shared by all.

Thinking that key industries should be nationalized, he asserted that the relation between employers and employed should be fair. Each side should have for the other a feeling of profound sympathy. Management and labour should jointly control the enterprise and, should they experience any disagreement, an impartial tribunal should be set up to give judgment. The wages of all, which should be as nearly equal as practicable, should be sufficient for well being and for reasonable comfort and, as the condition of labour should be either tiring or conducive to ill health, there should be at every factory recreation facilities, satisfactory sanitary arrangements and enough water. The management should provide for the workers, without in any way impairing the freedom of the latter, suitable housing. Workers should have a right to form unions, to bargain collectively and, in the event of the management making excessive demands, to strike.

As Gandhi condemned the class war so vehemently encouraged by the communists, he put forth the ideal of trusteeship. He maintained that the rich should, after having deliberately and gladly lowered their standard of living, use their surplus wealth for the good of the needy. That is why he regarded Jesus, who told that young aristocrat to sell up and give to the poor, as the greatest economist of the time. The Mahatma proclaimed, when the Russian ruler had, that revolution, however inevitable, should be pacific.

Aware that, even after the ideal society has been largely realized and, as a result, the human race has grown more content than ever before, crime will, although very much reduced, to some extent persist, Gandhi averred that prisons, which will therefore still be necessary, should be envisaged not as institutions for the punishment of malefactors, but as rehabilitation centres for the socially maladjusted, jail officials thus becoming the friends, instructors and spiritual advisors of the inmates. The death penalty should, according to him, be entirely abolished.

Gandhi assumed that similarly there will always have to be a police force, but that the members of it should, far from being, as now, protagonists of violence, evolve into a police brigade dedicated to the propagation of ahimsa. He held that, although these new police might have to be armed to deal with robber, murderer and lunatic, the weapons should be resorted to but rarely. When they were used, there would be, as he of course fully realised, a most tragic departure from the ideal of love.

Feeling not only that, should a dispute arise or a crime be committed, it ought to be privately and without bitterness settled by the parties involved, but also that, when such a procedure unfortunately cannot be followed, the *panchayat* should arbitrate. Gandhi was of the opinion that state law courts can never be entirely abolished, but he maintained that these should seldom be used and that, if unavoidably availed of, they should be cheap, speedy and efficient.

So that the young might be adequately prepared for the good society, Gandhi devised his system of home education. By this method, schooling should be imparted through marketable manual labour, for instance carding cotton, spinning, weaving, carpentry and gardening, in order to heal the rift between intellectualism and everyday life, and for all between the ages of seven and fourteen should be free and compulsory. As India is a land of so many religions, upholders of which are frequently hostile to one another, the Mahatma proclaimed that no theological instruction should be given in schools, but that pupils should be taught, by means of both the precept and the example of the teachers, the ideology of love common to all the higher religions of mankind.

According to this great pacifist, there should be disarmament followed by a freely created, properly democratic world government. He thought that perhaps a particular nation, distinguished by the heroism and purity of a majority of its members, will have, in order to set the fashions of practising ahimsa, to disarm unilaterally and that, if it should then be invaded, it ought to resist civilly and without violence.

Should a rural community have a dramatic society, a sensible play would be one proclaiming ahimsa. I was impressed by a specimen which, published in 1949 by the Malayalam writer, Edasseri Govindan Nayar, is entitled *Just Forgive*. The scene is a southern Malabar village in which are rich landlords, the fragmentation of peasant holdings, quarrels between Hindus and Muslims, strife between castes. There are two families, both of them in difficulties, one high caste Hindu and the other Muslim, the first landlord and the second tenant. When the old-fashioned head of the Hindu family dies, the new head, a young man imbued with gandhian ideals, Sathyan Nayar by name, wishes to end the litigation which, owing to the attempt of the deceased to evict Abu Bakar, the tenant, an old man, is in progress between the two families. He therefore

propose, what Abu Bakr agrees to, joint farming and common labour, a cooperative endeavour which is joined by Yehi, a low caste neighbour. Although they have to endure the opposition of reactionaries, they eventually reap a spectacular harvest which converts many an erstwhile enemy. In act two scene two, is a song in praise of the Mahatma, a song described by Abu Bakr as an incantation evoking confidence and the determination to work.

Ramakrishna had cancer of the throat, the disease which eventually killed him, and, as he had the power of withdrawing mind from body and thus experiencing the supreme identity, he was able, whenever the doctors wished to treat the malady, to transmute the power and in consequence feel no pain. Similarly one of the disciples, Swami Turyananda, on having to undergo a major operation and, through age and infirmity, being unable to take an anesthetic, withdrew mind from body and, to the great amazement of the surgeon, not only, while the proceeding was in progress, talked about God to the young monks present, but also showed not the slightest distortion of facial muscles and, the proceeding over, sang a hymn. These facts are given by Swami Akhilananda of the Ramakrishna Order in his book, *Minor's Health and Hindu Psychology*, and, as the author therein reminded us too, Ramakrishna opined that in the same way Jesus did not feel the crucifixion.

I have in my library two rare book written by Sri Paramahansa, the one a commentary on St Matthew's Gospel, the other a commentary on the Gospel according to St John, the first published in 1898, the second in 1903, and, in the view of this Indian writer, Jesus did not die on the cross, but went into a religious trance there and, after being placed in the tomb, regained consciousness and so eventually appeared to the disciples. Although this theory has been put forward from time to time by others as well, for instance, nowadays by members of the strictly non-violent Order of the Cross, there seems to be no evidence whatsoever to support it and, as can be learned from the statement that he descended into hell, that is to say into the realm of departed spirits, it has been vigorously asserted by the main body of Christians that their Lord really did die.

The Mahatma has pointed out that "even as Buddha and Christ chastised they showed unmistakable gentleness and love behind every act of them. They would not raise a finger against their enemies, but would gladly surrender themselves rather than the truth for which they lived. Buddha would have died retaining the priesthood, if the majority of his love had not proved to be equal to the task of heading the priesthood. Christ died on the Cross with a crown of thorns on his head defying the might of a whole Empire."

THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD, HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN, AND SITTING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, FROM THENCE HE SHALL COME TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

According to Christopher Isherwood, Ramakrishna made posthumous appearances. A few hours after the passing away of the ascetic, which Sarada Devi, his wife, following the Hindu custom, was, as a sign of her widowhood, removing her ornaments, he manifested himself and, taking her by the wrist, asked her not only why she was doing this, but also whether she really believed him to be dead. In consequence Sarada continued to wear her braids.

A week later, when Naray, subsequently to be known to the world as Swami Vivekananda, and another devotee, Harish by name, were standing near a pond in a garden, the former suddenly witnessed a draped, shaven figure coming towards them and, although, thinking that he might be the victim of a hallucination, he at first said nothing. Harish, thus indicating that he too saw the form, exclaimed, "What is that?" "Who is there?", then shouted Naray and, on hearing the noise, other disciples emerged from a house close by, but the figure disappeared near a summer bath about ten yards away.

Some months afterwards Sarada Nath Mitra, while meditating in his domestic shrine, was visited by Ramakrishna, who exhorted him to procure a house for the monastic disciples. Appropriate shelter was therefore soon found.

Sarada Devi, who evolved into a saint and came to be known as the Holy Mother, repeatedly saw her deceased husband. He taught her to be a spiritual dancer and once, as she was travelling by train to Vrindavan, he appeared at the carriage window, where he told her not to lose his gold aureole. After she had reached her destination, he re-appeared to remind her that he was still alive and, while she was in Vrindavan, he asked her to visit Jogindra, but, until he had manifested himself to her on two more occasions, she could not summon up enough courage to perform the task. Eventually she learned that Ramakrishna, having appeared to Jogindra also, had told him to receive initiation from her.

Likewise, Arthur Osborne has informed us that, after Ramana Maharshi had died, the modern man's continued presence and guidance were vividly felt by the devotees. For instance, a retired medical man, Dr D D. Asharya, bent in the evening of his life upon experiencing the Truth, decided, despite the ascetic's decree, to settle down at Ramanashram, where he put his healing skill at the disposal of those around him. When he had despondently thought that he was making no spiritual progress, he suddenly saw in a dream Sri Ramana, who, although they

had never met on earth, marvellously comforted him.

I was fascinated by the work, *Autobiography of a Yogi*, which, written by Paramahansa Yogananda, has a preface by the distinguished orientalist, W.Y. Evans-Wentz. As can be learned from the book, Paramahansa Yogananda's guru, that is to say his spiritual director, was Sri Yukteswar, an attractive personality, tall, straight, ascetic and of gentle manner and voice, whom Dr Evans-Wentz met and admired, and on 9 March 1936, this guru, then aged eighty-one, passed away. At three o'clock in the afternoon of 19 June 1936, while Paramahansa Yogananda was sitting on a bed in a Bombay hotel, he suddenly beheld the flesh and blood form of Sri Yukteswar, who, explaining that he had created for himself a new body from cosmic atoms, spoke at some length about the hereafter. He had hitherto posthumously appeared on 16 March 1936 to another disciple.

We are further informed in the book that, after he had died at the age of sixty-six on 26 September 1891, Lahori Mahasaya, Sri Yukteswar's guru, simultaneously appeared on the following morning at ten o'clock to three of his followers, each of them in a different city. He told one of the followers, Keshubchandra, that the remodelled form was made from the transmigrated atoms of the cremated body.

Even ordinary people sometimes reveal themselves after death. Here are two stories presented in his book, *A Biographical Outlook for Modern Man*, by Raynor C. Johnson: the first taken from the writings of the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, the second quoted from the Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research.

The bell rang in a minute and, on the minister going to the door, he found a young woman, whom he knew fairly well, but whom, as she lived five miles away, he had not seen for sixteen months. She asked whether he would visit her dying father and immediately, the accompanying him, he set out on the five mile walk. Arrived at the house, the minister was welcomed by the young woman's mother, who asked how he had heard of the trouble. He explained that the daughter had brought a message, but, when the man had soon afterwards passed away, the widow, newly bereaved and completely astounded, told the minister that the daughter had died a year ago. It so happened that, while walking over, he had passed two road workers and, now equally amazed, he decided that, should he meet them on his way home, he would ask them whether, when they previously saw him, he had a young woman with him. He did meet them again and, on his putting that question to them, one of them replied that, when passing them before, he was alone and talking away to himself as fast as he could go.

The next story is about a Mr James L. Chaffin, a farmer of North Carolina in the United States of America. On 16 November 1905, he made a will wherein, thus failing to provide for his wife and other three



sons, he left his property to his third son, Marshall, but on 16 January 1919, presumably repenting of this unfair procedure, he made a second will, which was unexecuted, and placed it between two pages of a Bible. The eccentric farmer then wrote on a piece of paper the words, 'Read the 27th chapter of Genesis in my daddy's old Bible', put the paper in the inner pocket of his overcoat and stitched the pocket up. He died on 7 September 1921, and, as no other person knew of the existence of the second will, Marshall duly obtained probate of the original one. In June 1925, the second son, James, began to have a series of vivid dreams about his late father, in which the latter, clad in his black overcoat said, 'You will find my will in my overcoat pocket', and, as a result, James, taking with him others as witnesses, found overcoat, paper, Bible and second will. There followed in December 1925 a lawsuit, the upshot being that the second will was pronounced valid.

Mindful of such psychic phenomena as these have recounted, I have no difficulty in believing that Jesus Christ, having risen from the dead, made a number of spectacular flesh and blood appearances.

After Ramana Mahanishi had died, his influence upon his devotees was, according to Arthur Osborne, even more potent than it had been before the decease, and Mahatma Gandhi, commiserating with Sri Anand Hingorani on the passing of the latter's wife, wrote as follows: 'You must not brood over Vidya's death nor get disconcerted. If she was the inspiration of your life whilst she was in the flesh, she must be more so, having gone to her resting place. That to me is the meaning of the true union of souls. The classic example is that of Jesus and in modern times of Ramakrishna. They become greater influences after their death. Their spirit did not die, nor is Vidya's dead. You must, therefore, leave off sorrowing and think of your duty in front of you.'<sup>1</sup>

Similarly Devadas, Gandhi's fourth son, who was managing editor of the *Minchaster Times*, said in a speech broadcast to the Indian nation on 5 February 1948, that is to say less than a week after his father's martyrdom, 'I would not waste time or emotion in fruitless sorrow over God's will. Bapu himself is in bliss. We no longer have his physical presence. But his spirit will guide and help us.'<sup>2</sup>

And at about the same time Mirabai, the daughter of a British admiral and one of the Mahatma's most faithful followers, wrote in an article, 'For me there were only two, God and Bapu. And now they have become one!'

'When I heard the news something deep, deep down within me opened—the door to the imprisoned soul—and Bapu's spirit entered there. From that moment a new sense of the eternal abides with me.

'Though Bapu's beloved physical presence is no longer with us, yet his sacred spirit is even nearer. Sometimes Bapu had said to me, "When the body is no more there will not be separation, but I shall be nearer to

you. The body is a hindrance." Now I know, through experience, the divine truth of these words.<sup>1</sup>

Even Jawaharlal Nehru whose outlook was, in spite of his great admiration for the Mahatma, secular rather than religious, was, according to Margaret Bourke-White, the American photographer, able publicly to say soon after the assassination of his hero, "The great light is extinguished. Darkness of sorrow and distress surrounds us all. I have no doubt he will continue to guide us from the borders of the Great Beyond."<sup>2</sup>

Just before he entered the prison, Jesus gave a long discourse about his second coming. He said that, when he returned to earth to establish the Kingdom of God, he would, accompanied by angels, messengers, to assist him in his work, come on the clouds of heaven with power and glory and that, although he did not know the day or hour of the event, it would take place before the contemporary generation had passed away. He mentioned that there would be definite signs of this coming, namely, war, earthquakes, famines, pestilences, the persecution of Christians, the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars from the firmament, the shaking of the celestial powers.

As Jesus in fact did not return in that way, it is extremely difficult to fathom what in this complicated speech he meant. We know that he was wont to speak parabolically and thus, according to some commentators, he was revealing that at a future date he would be reincarnated on earth and, in the view of others, he was asserting that he would in due course be followed by further incarnations, avatars. I am inclined to accept the latter suggestion.

At any rate, when we say that Jesus will come to judge the quick and the dead, we are expressing the belief that he continues to rule and guide us. In his book, *The Christian Creed*, Bishop C.W. Leadbeater, who, a notable theological leader, was one of the founders of the Liberal Catholic Church, recorded us that in the English of Queen Elizabeth I's day, the word 'judge', had a wider meaning than it possesses now and, to prove his point he presented two quotations from the Book of Judges in the Old Testament, the first being that 'Deborah judged Israel at that time', the second that Jael, a Gileadite, 'judged Israel twenty and two years' [so as contrasted]

1. *Review*, 12 4 36.

2. *Daily Mail*, 29 67.

3. *Young India*, 12 5 30.

4. *Review*, 12 7 48.

5. *The Gandhi Reader: A Source Book of his Life and Writings*, Edited by Homer A. Jack (London: Dornan Edition, 1934) p. 439.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 451.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 462.

# What is the most worthwhile work?

MARIE B. BYLES

'This world of men suffers bondage from all action save that which is done for the sake of sacrifice; to this end performs action without attachment' *Disputed Gita*, 3.9. [Gandhi's comment: 'Action for the sake of sacrifice' means acts of selfless service dedicated to God.] 'Cast all thy acts on Me, with thy mind fixed on the indwelling Atman, and without any thought of fruit, or sense of 'me', shake off thy fever and light.' *Ibid.*, 5.30. 'Better one's own duty, hereof of merit, than another's well performed, better a death in discharge of one's duty, another's duty is fraught with danger' *Ibid.*, 5.35.

In the midst of so much sincerely earnest work to stop the manufacture of nuclear weapons, or the war in Vietnam, or injustices to Negroes, or the rising population of India, and the like, do the followers of the Mahatma ever enquire whether these and the many other worthy causes are really the most important? Do they ever remember back to the fact that he never invited anyone to leave his own work to join the non-violent campaign for Indian independence, and that for him the worthwhileness of any work was not the objective but the spirit in which it is done.

In *Gandhi May* of October 1965 I tried to shed light on the basis of nonviolence by looking at the teaching of Tenko San, the Japanese spiritual leader. In this I shall try to show how Tenko San's teaching throws light on Gandhi's and the *Gita's* conception of the ingredients without which no work, not even trying to stop the manufacture of nuclear weapons, is of any value.

Unlike Gandhi's, Tenko San's life work did not begin with public service. He only once entered Parliament, and when his found his wisdom was not understood there, he did not stand for a second term of office. He exercised a tremendous influence on the moral and spiritual life of Japan, an influence even observed by the *New York Times*. But

it was not in public life. Like Gandhi, however, his work was inspired by a religious experience from which he realized that if we serve others without thought of self or reward for self, but solely as a thank offering to Light (or God) for the opportunity of doing it, then all that is required for our sustenance will come of its own accord as milk comes to the mother's breasts when the babe is born.

What follows is the story of my own experience when living with his lay disciples and with his community of about 300 men, women and children known as *Itosen*. *Itosen* came into existence at the beginning of this century from the small band of men and women who gathered around him to do without payment the menial work that anyone would give them. It was very different from the work that Gandhi undertook, but it agrees perfectly with the quotations that head this essay and which were the criterion by which Gandhi would have judged the worthwhileness of any work. Perhaps a study of these experiences will enable us to be more critical of the spirit in which we, the followers of Gandhi, are performing whatever work we do.

Almost the first thing I learned was that, for Tenko San, cleaning other people's toilets was the most important and significant of all work, cleaning, not emptying (the farmers need the contents for manure too badly to spare it for strangers to empty, and of course some of the toilets cleaned are sewered). Toilet cleaning has become for *Itosen* a religious ritual, and the children are trained to take part in it as soon as they are in senior high school. The men and women who come to *Itosen* for the monthly four-day training course find it is first on the schedule. Finally several times during the year *Itosen's* members go to distant places for *Gyogan*, as it is called.

Why did Tenko San regard this humble, not very pleasant, work as the most worthwhile?

I went on three *Gyogan* expeditions during the two periods I was in Japan.

The first I have described in *Partis to Inner Calm*. It was part of the four days' monthly training course to which about seventy trainees came. We assembled in the school playground. Ayako San, the English teacher, had dressed me like the others in a short black kimono and white headscarf with the circle of ocarinas in front. We chanted the *Gyogan* poem and then we each picked up a bucket, small bamboo brush and a thick rag, and marched out single file between an avenue of *Itosen's* members holding their hands prayerwise, crossed the canal and passed down the street to the village.

It was a long walk and the sun was hot. I began to get very tired until I remembered that I was doing this work for the Light. And then somewhat to my own surprise the tiredness disappeared.

Ayako San stopped opposite a temple and our assignment start-

ed later. The rest of the long line continued on.

We knocked at the door and a general priest of the Jodo Sect opened it. Ayako San said, "We are from Itozumi. May we clean your *obengo* (honourable toilet) for the sake of the peace of the world and our own atonement of selfishness?" The priest thanked her and showed us what was a very clean *obengo*. However, we made it a little cleaner still. Afterwards I asked him through Ayako San what he thought of Itozumi's toilet cleaning. Were we mad, stupid or of use? He replied that he was very grateful to us.

The same formula was repeated at every house. Several women said they had already cleaned the toilet. At some houses everyone was away. The ones down a back alley included a really filthy *obengo* and the mother, who was washing clothes with the assistance of her baby in the tiny backyard, was generously grateful and gave us soap and water to clean our hands when we had finished. At another there was no tap from which to draw the water, we had to dip it out of the stream that runs through the township and afterwards empty the bucket and wash the rug and brush in the same stream.

After about an hour our arguments ended. I had seen the inside of many poor houses—as well as become an authority on the cleanliness of *obengos*!

When we returned one of the older men greeted us with hands-prayer-wise, and I felt, rightly or wrongly, that I had been accepted into Itozumi. Also, people now seemed to notice me and greet me with a smile as one of themselves.

To me it was an interesting adventure. I did not pretend to understand the why and wherefore. It made an amusing incident in lectures that I gave about Itozumi when I returned home.

The second Gyogan expedition was at Ito, where Makoto Ohashi San, a member of Itozumi, took me to visit a retired electrical contractor, and lay member of Itozumi. After lunch we set off with white head-scarf, bucket, brush and rug, crossed the railway line and called on at the first house along the narrow main street of the village. In response to Makoto San's request the young man of the house readily showed us the toilet. After we had duly cleaned it I asked through Makoto San the same question as Ayako San had asked the general Jodo priest. He replied that it was a very mysterious art. Makoto San said he was a serious young man and understood. We proceeded down the street and called on at many other houses and were refused, and in between I snapped Makoto San walking down the street with his long black kim tucked up and showing white pants underneath. I admit I was concerned to tell the story at lectures afterwards. I still did not understand what it was all about. The man at the last house acceded at once to Makoto San's pleading. He belonged to one of the hundred and seventy-one new religions of Japan.

(see Harry Thurman's *The New Religions of Japan*) and a number of devotees were gathered in his house for a meeting of worship. He of course understood our reason for wanting to clean the toilet, and seized the opportunity to give us some literature concerning his own religion.

I found out afterwards that Makoto San had been deeply hurt at my completely detached interest in what for him was a religious undertaking. He said that my flippant attitude had hindered him in what was a difficult matter even when our prayer was granted, still more when it was refused. I did not know I had been flippant, and I was most unhappy that I had hurt the feelings of the man who had done so much to help me. After my return home I received a rather pathetic letter from one of my English pupils at Itoon in which she told me about their Gyogan expedition and how very glad she was anyone did let them clean the toilet.

Trains came for the monthly four-day training course soon after I arrived at Itoon on my second visit to Japan. There were about forty men and twenty women. The workshop hall was fairly full for the 3.30 a.m. sessa chanting. I noticed that some of the men masters were obviously not accustomed to kneeling on tatami mats, and occasionally knelt up Roman Catholic style to ease their aching ankles.<sup>1</sup> At 5 a.m. they brought the sessa books with them and gathered in the school playground as previously. Each line was headed by an experienced man or woman Itoon member according to the sex of the trainees. They read the sessa as they chanted and their attitude was one of deep dedication and solemnity. They then took up bucket, rag and brush and set forth in a long defile between the avenue of Itoon members with hands prayerwise. This time I formed part of the avenue except that from time to time I broke away to take photos. Dear, dear, finding Teiko San was taken in his wheel chair, helped out, and stood all alone at the roadside with hands prayerwise to bless them as they passed. It was obviously the work dearest to his heart and he was tremendously happy to see the men and women file past him.

A month later trainees came again, well over seventy of them, and this time, when Itoon members were also assembled, the workshop hall was so packed that the men being in the majority overflowed onto the women's side.

This time at my request Ayako San again took me on the expedition. But my back had been getting steadily worse and I was walking with a limp, and when I heard that we had a long way to go I said I must get a taxi—wholly out of tune with Gyogan of course, but I could not have managed otherwise. I pictured us coming by taxi to the scene of action just after the trainees. But Japanese taxis have a habit of arriving ten minutes early, and somehow it got mixed up in the procession. I was aghast, and extremely miserable mentally as well as physically! I

am afraid I got almost angry trying to convince Ayako San that she simply must make the tea wait until everyone had got away.

We paid the tea off when we reached the place assigned and continued on foot. We ended up at the University where the toilets were filthy. To me that work was well worth while. I was only sorry that we had not provided ourselves with some cleaning powder so that we could make a really good job, and I was a little sad that the time allotted having expired we had to leave without disposing of the rubbish. These things show I still failed to understand the basic reason for these Gyogan expeditions, nor why on our return we should be greeted like saints before whom the elders bowed very humbly.

The last incident concerning Gyogan was a general meeting at which to decide arrangements for a Gyogan expedition for fifteen members at the end of November. Everyone was very serious and Takeko San, the business head of Inoue, read passages from *Tenko San's Life of Sango*, just as a parson would quote from the Bible. Others recalled previous expeditions and the inspiration that they had gathered from them. Finally it was decided that before this one there would be an all night vigil at St Kobo Temple's temple. On the date arranged for this, Takeko San, Ayako San, the only woman, and several of the young men left about 8 p.m. I was told they spent most of the night on discussing arrangements for the Gyogan expedition, meditated from about midnight until 2 a.m. and then slept until 6 a.m. when they returned to finish off their night's sleep under more comfortable conditions. It was of the Gyogan expedition that followed that my English pupil wrote saying how glad she was when anyone did let them clean the toilet.

I pondered over these Gyogan expeditions for several months after my return. What was the point of them? The natural inclination is to dismiss them as a joke. But one cannot do this. Tenko San had been a tremendous spiritual and moral force in Japan and his writings show profound wisdom and insight, and he had made Gyogan the core of his teaching. What is more, it is the core of the life, not only of fifteen members, but of the Koyakai, the lay disciples. On the 15th of each month the lay disciples dress in the uniform of the short black kim and the white head scarf, and an off and on distant place to "do Gyogan". These lay disciples include the heads of industrial undertakings, such as Noritake China, known throughout the world, as well as professional people and factory workers. Imagine the head of an English, let alone Indian, industrial concern, talking forth as a religious duty, far more important than going to church, to beg humbly for the favour of cleaning the toilet of an unknown house, and bowing gratefully whether permitted or refused. It is all very well to say that Japan is accustomed to monks and nuns going from house to house chanting sutras or asking for alms. This type of Japanese is now rare and I never saw such

And the fact that more often than not the supplicant is refused shows that Japanese people are no more accustomed to this sort of exorbitancy than Western people. It is humiliating to ask even when the request is granted and still more when refused. If the object were to clean dirty public toilets which badly needed cleaning, many people in the West could understand even though they refused to undertake such work themselves. But that is not the object. Most of the toilets are perfectly clean already, and there was no special merit in the good work we did at the University.

I was still puzzling over the apparently religious significance of Gyogan when I received two of Ayako San's letters, in each of which she described toilet-cleaning expeditions to distant places, how wonderful the experience and how happy she had been. She had felt she was with the Buddha and the saints. She liked this kind of "prayer" best of all. By prayer she obviously did not mean petitionary prayer as ordinarily understood, but rather the sense of oneness with God or seeing the Deities, as the Puff Texts put it.

I remembered the dedicated look on the faces of some of the lay people, especially the head of Nontake China Company, when they returned from toilet cleaning. I began to understand. I realized that true service can be given only when there is humility, absence of self and absence of consciousness of the usefulness of the work. The object of Gyogan would seem to be the cultivation of this prerequisite of all true service. Gyogan is a religious ceremony comparable to Holy Communion for the Christian, when the participant feels the member of Christ to the very core of his being, a love so sublime that it demands to give himself utterly to his Saviour. Anatta, the knowledge of selflessness in actual experience, lies at the centre of all religions, and religious understanding. Ceremonies and rituals come into existence as the outward expression of that inward quest. There is the further point that peace between people is only possible in so far as the sense of self-importance is given up. Hence the plea to be allowed to clean the honourable toilet for the sake of the peace of the world as well as our own self-abnegation.

It would seem that the most worthwhile work is that done in the spirit of these Gyogan expeditions. This is very different from the idea of most good, well-meaning people that the best work is that which helps others—we need not consider the popular idea that the best work is that which earns the most money! The trouble with this criterion of helpfulness is that we never know when we are doing good and helping others. The skillful doctor who saves the life of a child may have saved the life of a future murderer. In any case the results of the best work are always transient. The Emperor Asoka of India ruled his realm with the power of loving-kindness and good works, but the general peace



and well-being he brought into existence ended shortly after his death.

I thought of the work I had done during the two months at Inoue. Foremost was the completion of the book, *A New Road to Archaic Truth*, Makoto Uchida's translation of a part of Tenko San's *Life of Sango*, which I had put into idiomatic English. The most stimulating and delightful work had been teaching English conversation to the brightest senior school children. But the happiest, and now I come to think of it, the most valuable work, had been sweeping up the leaves from the pebbled paths and moss lawns under the wooded hills. That was the first job after breakfast ended at 6:30 a.m. Everyone who passed greeted me with a bright smile and hands prayerwise, and the tiny brooklet that ran at the foot of the hills seemed to smile equally brightly before it peered under a small stone bridge and fell into the little lake with gold fishes and a miniature island. I cannot honestly say I did this work in the spirit of the Gyogan prayer, for obviously everyone regarded it as a good work and I went up in their conviction by doing it. And also there were several objections to it, the need to put the drag heaven on a bonfire placed in exactly the right position for its smoke to blow over the laundry hanging out on bamboo poles, and far more serious than making the laundry dirty was the waste of good material that should have been composted. Near the end on looking back, the work of sweeping leaves—only to sweep more leaves again next day—seems to me the most significant. Why? Because it was an opportunity for meditating on the One Light, beyond all and in all, and the nothingness of my own self. It therefore contained at least some of the essential ingredients of *Gyogan*.

And that brings us to Takahata and Boto, the second most important matter in Inoue life. Takahata is Inoue's same name humble selfless service rendered without expectation of reward or thanks, but solely as an offering to Light out of gratitude for the opportunity of being able to help expiate the evils of the world. Now is the state of a beggar, homeless and penniless, and also far from the spiritual state of one not attached to knowledge, self-pride, worldly love or resentment.

As I have said, Inoue arose from the little band of people who gathered about Tenko San to do Takahata. They went along the roadside and asked at houses if they could do work without payment or reward of any kind. The original Inoue members had no home of their own. They lived in a continuous state of Boto, homeless and penniless as beggars. Inoue is very different nowadays. It owns land, buildings and other property, and the lives of its members are secure, for though none has any property of his own, each is given all that is necessary.

But as with *Gyogan*, so with Takahata—when the monks come for the monthly four days' training course, a Takahata expedition is the second item on the schedule. They go along the roadside in a state

of Roto, offering their services without payment. If lunch is given to them, well and good, if lunch is not given to them, that is also well and good. At least once a year a great many of Itosen's members go Roto for longer periods and to distant places.

The second month I was in Itosen, Ayako San took me with the Takahata expedition of the Itansen. As we had not far to walk I was spared the embarrassment of requiring a taxi, although I was firing some shots over. It was raining. We stood for about half an hour in a line down the footpath beside the tiny brook and outside the Hall of Light, while we were told all about Takahata—at least I suppose that was what the lecture was about, but as it was in Japanese I was conscious only of the mud and an aching back. We then set off down the path and across the canal between the same avenue of Itosen members with hands prayerwise. We marched along the opposite bank to a Shinto shrine less than a mile away. The cotton oil paper umbrellas and short black kimonos looked most artistic in the misty light.

We stopped in front of the shrine to worship by clapping the hands twice and bowing, and then set off in different directions. Ayako San asked me if I preferred quiet houses or gay tea shops. Of course I preferred quiet houses. We tramped along for some time and then began knocking at the doors of the quiet houses. No one wanted us or our work. Either there was no one responsible at home, or they were indisposed or out. Then we tried a high class guest house, where they were clearing the breakfast after their guests had gone out for the day. A trustee had forestalled us, but there was work for us also, and we were taken into the large living room. My first impression was that it was already spotlessly clean. No one would have suspected that a large number of guests had eaten their evening meal and breakfast there sitting on cushions on the floor, still less that they had amused themselves in various ways during the evening. There was hardly a grain of rice and only two cigarette marks on the whole of that large spread of tatami matting. We stacked the cushions and wiped down the tatami matting with a damp rag, and likewise the polished boards and the sliding glass screens and the verandas beyond. I did the tops of the woodwork, which my superior height—5 feet 2 inches—could easily reach. We then went into the passages and did the same work. Finally I poked my way into a very back passage and removed the 'waken-drop' dust from the top ledges. I afterwards doubted whether the owners appreciated my intrusion into the dark recesses which no one sees, for I remembered hearing that the Japanese housewife is clean but not hygienic—like most Westerners for that matter!

Despite the body's unhappiness I had enjoyed doing something useful and no payment spoilt the pleasure.

After that we tried in vain to get more work. Ayako San said that

the gay quarter of the town with us is shops would have had plenty of work. But I was now finding a difficulty to drag one stride after the other and I simply could not walk further. I said I must go back. I sat on the damp ground beside the canal, relaxed and meditated and walked back along the quiet waters. We picked up rubbish dropped by pedestrians. This seemed to me to be a good form of *Takuhatsu*, but as far as I could gather Ayuko San did not regard it as of much merit. Perhaps she thought it was not rendering service to anyone in particular.

With my altogether mistaken criterion as to what work was worthwhile, I had found the best *Takuhatsu* was an expedition to Nagoya Castle before going to Innon when I accompanied the *Koyukai* or lay disciples. The management of Nagoya Castle, which is a tourist attraction, had contacted the secretary of the local *Koyukai* as to the possibility of their doing a little cleaning-up work. The picturesque castle is many stories high and can be seen a long way off. It is surrounded by the usual moat, but instead of water this is now filled with vegetable gardens. We met about fifty of the *Koyukai* outside the entrance, where we donned the white head-scarf with the circle of oneness, and then went in by another gate than the tourists. We had come together from various places around Nagoya city. Among us were Y I Ps, such as managers of large companies, and employees from their factories. I remember especially a young girl happy to come so that she could earn herself for marriage. In Australia, it would not be unusual for the company manager and a girl in the factory to meet at the same working bee, but in Japan the Y I Ps and the proletariats do not as a rule mix together, and the meeting here was significant. Our work consisted of clearing up rubbish and weeding footpaths. I thoroughly enjoyed gathering up the refuse and emptying rubbish-containers into a truck. This was really useful work. But I wished we had provided ourselves with something better than fingers for taking weeds out of the hard ground of the footpaths.

Work finished—or more correctly the allotted time having expired—we gathered together once again for some chatting and photographs. Because there was a foreigner with the *Koyukai*, a representative from the largest Nagoya newspaper had come to find out what Innon was about. She edited the weekly page on religion and was genuinely and sincerely interested. On the surface Japanese people have very little interest in religion except for weddings and funerals, but the largest paper can spare a whole page for any aspect of any religion the women in charge care to write about.

The gathering at Nagoya Castle was like that at a church or temple, but it was more than a ceremony for worship, more than a duty, and far more than the usual social gathering outside the church door after the service. Some, such as a farmer, had come a great distance. This farmer

had heard of Tenko San about twenty-five years before. He had a longing to find the ideal life and Itosen gave him what he sought. Five or six times he attended the four days' training course. His life as a farmer did not alter, but its basis altered. He began to take an active part in serving his community, especially a youth group which he formed to promote better techniques in farming. The villagers came to trust him because they knew his one desire was to give service in the Itosen spirit.

I think that all who came carried over into their daily lives the spirit of service of their Takahata at Nagaya castle. But the one who impressed me most was the one I remember as 'the wedding dress man'. He was the secretary of the Nagaya Koyaku and easy to remember because of his bushy overhanging eyebrows. He had heard of Tenko San about forty years before when *Life of Sango* was first published. He was only twenty and wanted to join Itosen then and there. But his family would not hear of it. He therefore decided that, even though he was merely an employee, he would do his work in the Itosen spirit. When he married he and his wife opened a shop for selling kimonos and carried on the work in the same Itosen spirit. It started in a small way but grew rapidly. Then he conceived a brilliant idea as to how they might better serve their customers. The cost of the bride's kimono is crippling to her parents. How would it be if they could hire instead of buying? The hiring out of wedding attire, both Japanese and European, and the attire for the bride's and bridegroom's parents now became a large business. A few months before I was there he and all his staff went for the four days' Itosen training course in three consecutive months. While at Itosen they decided that thenceforth the day's work should be commenced with a short service of dedication. When I later viewed his premises he showed me the words they repeated. Ayako San later translated them.

May we be always thoughtful and industrious so that we help to create a better social order.

May we enjoy both our work and our fellowship with the other workers to the end that our cooperation create lasting happiness and prosperity.

May what we make be good and become more and more widely known to have benefited people, so that our work is helpful to society.

May we always have the spirit of humility and a consciousness of our responsibility for the evils of the world, and may our efforts express our gratitude for this opportunity (to help expiate the evils of the world).

We make these gowns with a sincere desire for the happiness of those who will wear them and so that the joyful brides may look both beautiful and noble.

Though our work may be exacting, our constant efforts for ongo-

reality show the worth of youthful aspiration.

It is a true teaching that guides us. Therefore in our daily work we shall be diligent and perform it with thanksgiving.

Because of the infinite Light that is given to us we live good and worthwhile lives.

I spoke with others of the Koyukai afterwards and they left me with no doubt as to the religious nature of these expeditions and that these lay disciples carried the same spirit into their every day business lives.

But I am not so sure that the same applies to the younger generation of Inoue members who have all been born into the community, who have often not even read Tenko San's *Life of Sogye*, and hardly knew Tenko San in their childhood and youth. They therefore have little understanding of the homeless life of the early members. For them Gyogan and Takahata are like religious ceremonies from which the life has partly gone. When I asked the senior high school children what they thought about them, many replied, they liked them 'a little' or 'fifty-fifty'. They obviously had no idea of their inner meaning. But this applies to all religious ceremonies. That which was once alive and free becomes only half alive because it is fettered in form.

What emerges from an examination of Gyogan and Takahata is that no work has value in itself. Its value depends upon the spirit in which the work is done.

Who sweeps a room for Christ's sake

Makes that and the action his.

In other words the worthwhileness of work depends upon awareness of the worthwhileness both of the work and the worker, and the reality only of That which is not of the earth and remains entirely unaffected by the work done—a paradise, but life consists of' paradises.

One of the worst hindrances to working with this awareness is the interfering intellect, which prevents us thinking 'about it and about' instead of being merely aware. The work of the humble paragon remover may therefore be of more value than that of the learned priest, monk or layman who lectures on the teaching of the Buddha, Christ, Tenko-San or Gandhi. When we are engaged in easy mental work it is far easier to keep the mind fixed on Light or Krishna or God. Perhaps that is one reason why Aynko San found these Gyogan expeditions more satisfying than teaching English which is an intellectual occupation. Perhaps, too, that was one reason why Mahatma Gandhi insisted that body labour was necessary for all.

An even worse hindrance is the consciousness that we are doing good and helping people. Ananthapadika, the friend of the orphan and destitute and one of the Buddha's leading lay disciples, discovered that what really mattered was not his great benefactions but awareness of the transience of all he did to help the orphan and destitute. That

is the difficulty that begets all beneficent people. Unless they remember that the results of all the work they do will pass, they become puffed up with the good they do for others; when pride arises humility departs, and with it the ability to give any true service to anyone.

Humility is a difficult attitude to maintain, especially when one's work is successful or appears to be beneficial. That is the advantage of these Gyogan expeditions. It forces the suppliant to be humble. I cannot conceive of anyone being proud and self-important, especially when, after asking for the privilege of cleaning another person's toilet, he is refused. But also I cannot conceive of the method of forcing humility ever being employed in my own affluent country. The suppliant might not be handed over to the reception house for the insane, but he would certainly be regarded, like all evangelists who invade the privacy of our homes, as a public nuisance.

Expeditions to do manual work, such as we did at Nagoya castle, would not be impossible, but would not necessarily make for humility. They would, however, form a firm basis for a religious community among lay people who sought to follow Tonko San's teaching. But such religious gatherings would be of no more value than church services unless the spirit of humble selfless service, dedicated to Light, were carried over into everyday work. For when all attempts to do humble manual work have been exhausted, the fact remains that the most worthwhile work is that for which our nature fits us and which falls to our hands, when it is performed without thought of self, or thought of benefiting another but solely for Light—or God or Krishna—that is to say, for That which is beyond anything of this world.

**GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
CHECKLIST OF ENGLISH PUBLICATIONS**

1. Anantlal Mehra. **FREEDOM FROM FEAR**. Edited by T.K. Mahadevan. First edition 1948. 31 p. Paper. Rs 1. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
2. Richard B. Gregg. **I WANT A JOB OR WHAT CAN I DO?** First edition 1941. 36 p. Paper. Rs 0.50. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
3. J.B. Kripalani. **GANDHIAN THOUGHT**. First edition 1941. 281 p. Cloth. Rs 4.50. Calcutta: Orient Longman.
4. Symposium. **WHITHER INDIA?** First edition. 1942. 182 p. Paper. Rs 1. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
5. Padmini Walker and Maurice Brown. **TALKING OF GANDHI**. Paperback edition, 1965. 84 p. Paper. Rs 1.50. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
6. T.K. Mahadevan, Adam Roberts and Gora Sharp. **CIVILIAN DEFENCE**. First edition 1957. 282 p. Cloth. Rs 12. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
7. G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan. **GANDHI: HIS RELEVANCE FOR OUR TIMES**. Second edition 1967. 282 p. Cloth. Rs 25. New Delhi: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
8. D.G. Tondkar. **ABOUT GHAFAR KHAN**. First edition 1951. 126 p. Cloth. Rs 60. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
9. G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan. **NONVIOLENCE AFTER GANDHI**. First edition 1958. 59 p. Paper. Rs 1. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
10. S. Radhakrishnan. **MAHATMA GANDHI. NO YEARS**. First edition 1948. 481 p. Cloth. Rs 17.50. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
11. Henryman Munier. **GREAT SOUL**. First Indian edition. 1949. 104 p. Paper. Rs 7.75. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
12. S. Abul Hasan. **GANDHI AND COMMUNAL UNITY**. First edition 1959. 151 p. Paper. Rs 4.75. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
13. B.L. Devdas. **SAGA OF SATYAGRAHA**. Revised new edition. 1949. 241 p. Cloth. Rs 9. Paper. Rs 7. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
14. Roy Walker. **WORD OF GOLD**. First edition 1949. 200 p. Cloth. Rs 12.50. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
15. K. Seshasairam. **AN ANTHOLOGY OF INDIAN LITERATURES**. First edition. 1949. 124 p. Cloth. Rs 30. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
16. Saradita Varma. **METAPHYSICAL FOUNDATION OF MAHATMA GANDHI'S THOUGHT**. First edition. 1979. 171 p. Cloth. Rs 1.50. Paper. Rs 5. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
17. T.K. Mahadevan. **TRUTH AND NONVIOLENCE**. First edition. 1979. 400 p. Cloth. Rs 15. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
18. G. Ramachandran and T.K. Mahadevan. **QUEST FOR GANDHI**. First edition 1979. 451 p. Cloth. Rs 18. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
19. V.V. Ramana Murti. **GANDHI: ESSENTIAL WRITINGS**. First edition 1979. 476 p. Cloth. Rs 15. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
20. C.B. Dalal. **GANDHI 1915-1947: A DETAILED CHRONOLOGY**. First edition. 1971. 116 p. Cloth. Rs 16. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
21. Tuk Chand. **LIQUOR MENACE IN INDIA**. First edition 1971. 124 p. Cloth. Rs 30. Paper. Rs 12. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
22. Prem Chopra. **THE SAGE IN REVOLT: A REMEMBRANCE**. First edition. 1972. 282 p. Cloth. Rs 26. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
23. Homer A. Jack. **RELIGION FOR PEACE**. First edition. 1973. Cloth. Rs 15. Paper. Rs 9. Bombay: Bharamya Vidya Bhavan.
24. Sarita Rajgopalary. **PILGRIM CENTENARY: A REMEMBRANCE**. First edition 1973. 317 p. Cloth. Rs 40. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

*Obtainable from*

**GANDHI BOOK HOUSE**  
Rajghat, New Delhi, 110021

# Visit GUJARAT

Famous for its Cultural and Archaeological Heritage.

## GIR - THE LAND OF LIONS -

Gir is a pre-historic home of the Indian Lion. In existence of 1875 by these lions are 250000. They can be seen in their natural habitat from very close quarters.



**SUN TEMPLE - MODHERA** - The early around Sun Temple at Modhera is a fine specimen of the superb craftsmanship of the Gujarat architects. The temple complex consisting of the Ranganatha temple, during the reign of of Vishnu Chola (1025-1075) and its main part of the wall with four towers of the city.

## SAPUTARA - A SILVER BEAUTY OF GUJARAT -

The New Red Forest in Gujarat is situated on the second highest plateau on the Sahyadri range running through Gujarat State in order of green and deep forest of Deodar, there more or less 1000 feet.



For Detailed information please contact:

- (1) The Director of Information, Government of Gujarat, Secretary, Block No. 8, Gandhinagar, Near Ashramdham, Tel: 224-444-447
- (2) Tourism Office, Ashram Building, Near Rajendra Cinema, Lal Darwaja, Ashramdham, Tel: 2272
- (3) Gujarat Information Centre, 4 Imperial Building, Town Hall, New Delhi, Tel: 6626
- (4) Gujarat Government Tourism Office, Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj Building, Tel: 22777



# IN BACK NUMBERS

1969

January

- William R. Miller : Gandhi and King—Pioneers of Modern Nonviolence  
T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to the Study of Gandhi  
S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

April

- A Controversy : The Meaning of Gandhi  
Robert Payne : The Inheritance of Gandhi  
Italo De Sola Pool : Violence in Villages  
Saurit Nelson : Caste and Untouchability—and Gandhi

July

- R.R. Dinker : The Lokasamgraha and the Mahatma  
Shubert Shuttacharya : Some Reflections on Gandhi the Writer  
Ernie Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and the Goshdas  
S. M. Tiwari : Four Questions on Gandhi's Philosophy

October

- Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and Social Revolution  
A.S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social Philosophy  
Roselind Schama : The Obligations of the Individual  
B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as a Source of his Influence

1970

January

- Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and Dissent in America  
George Luker : Strategy for Non-violent Revolution  
James E. Bristol : The Draft Repeal Movement in the United States  
Johanne Bosch : Erkkon's Gandhi

April

- T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Adulthood of Mahatma Gandhi  
K. G. Sanyal : Gandhi's Lovable Personality  
P. Raghuraj Rao : The Gandhian Concept of Dharma  
Les Bowman : Totalitarianism or Nonviolence?

July

- Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of Citizenship  
R. Sankaran : Gandhi's Way of Life  
R. R. Dinker : Dynamics of Ahimsa  
Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National Defence Strategist

October

- Grant Code : The Gurus : 1854-1918  
James D. Hunt : Thoreau and Gandhi : A Re-evaluation of the Legacy  
T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in the Seventies  
T. K. N. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

## IN BACK NUMBERS

**1971**

**January**

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

Ije Lazar-Pawloski : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

**April**

James W. Douglass : The Revolution is the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

N. G. S. Kiri : Techniques and Taste of Gandhian Revolution

K. Guptaewer : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

**July**

Gerald Horwitz : The Idea of a Mass Decent Movement

John Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murli : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

**October**

Ramak Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Lohia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U. S. Navy

Ramkrishna Vetary : Gandhi and Technical Education

**1972**

**January**

G. Tucci : A Meditation on Gandhi  
Donald H. Bishop : The Presuppositions of Nonviolence

Mansranjan Jha : Gandhi, Civil Disobedience and American Officials

R.S. Markandkar : The Theory of Resistance in Ancient India

**April**

Symposium : India After Bangle Dash

Homer A. Jack : The India-Pakistan Crisis of the U.N.

W. L. Gargan Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Marie B. Dylke : Moral Basis of Violence and Nonviolence

**July**

Lewis Mumford : The Pentagon of Power

James Warren Gould : The Future of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Diwakar : Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy : Its Universality

James W. Douglass : The Yin-Yang of Resistance and Contemplation

**October**

Maurice Friedman : The Community of Otherness and the Covenant of Peace

James E. Bristol : Nonviolence not First for Export

James J. Preston : Religion and Political Process in Gandhi and Tolstoy

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

REGD. NO. 10/244/1971 PUBLISHERS' AND PRINTERS' CENTRAL EXCISE LICENCE  
NO. 10/244-71-72

66

200000



17/3

VOL. 17 . No. 3 . JULY . 1973 .

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

# GANDHI MARG

SHATTACHARYYA / CHAUDHURI / DAS / DAS-  
GUPTA / JOHN / KRIPALANI / MAJUMDAR / MAL-  
KANI / MEADOWS / MISRA / MODY / MUKERJEE / NAM-  
BOODIRIPAD / NARAYAN / NARLA / RANGA / SHAH /  
SUBRAMANYAM / THAPAR / TRIPATHI / WALLACE

## IN BACK NUMBERS

**1967**

### **January**

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism  
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic  
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference  
P. Nagaraja Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Atmava

### **April**

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd  
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance  
Jerry Swicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research  
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

### **July**

Martin Luther King : The Casualties of the War in Vietnam  
John R. Rees : The Concept of Deterrence  
R. R. Diwakar : Gandhi and Man in Evolution  
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

### **October**

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi  
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love  
Karen Monson and Martin Grotjohn : Racial Prejudice and the Incest Taboo  
T. V. Parvati : Talk and Gandhi

**1968**

### **January**

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities  
Marie B. Byles : Truth is God  
Jayaprakash Narayan : The Outlook for Peace in India  
Ralph David Assenseth : Religion and World Peace

### **April**

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare  
Bo Winmark : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence  
T.R. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation  
Norm Chomsky : The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste

### **July**

Maurice Friedman, Martin Luther King: An American Gandhi and a Modern Job  
Melford Q. Soley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution  
Stuart Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign  
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

### **October**

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence ?  
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?  
H.J.N. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impatience  
R. R. Diwakar : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

# GANDHI MARG 66

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN- NUMBER THREE JULY 1979

## Editors

G. Ramachandras

T. K. Mahadevan

## Editorial Board

R. R. Diwaker

J. B. Kripalani

Jayaprakash Narayan

Abid Hussain

Vijaya Hari

G. Ramachandras

Shrinani Narayan

Bhavani Prasad Misra

Radhakrishna

Devendra Kumar Gupta

T. K. Mahadevan (Corresponder)

# Contents

|                    |     |  |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| Editorials         | 179 | Politics of service versus politics of power |
|                    | 182 | Beyond democracy and socialism               |
| Symposium          | 184 | Democracy, socialism—and Gandhi              |
| Dennis L. Meadows  | 217 | The Equilibrium State                        |
| Michael D. Wallace | 226 | Peace research: the radical critique         |
| A Bibliography     | 261 | Looking into the future, 1950-1970           |

II ISSN 0814-4437

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CARD NO. 58-47534

Rs. 1.50 a year in South Asia; \$ 1.50 elsewhere: postfree. Rs. 3.00 (\$ 1.50) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates: 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Complaints about non-receipt: (inland) within 15 days; (foreign) within 45 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money orders only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 311/321 Doot Deyal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi 110 081 and printed by him at the Kaveri Printing Press, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110 022.

## Editorials

### POLITICS OF SERVICE VERSUS POLITICS OF POWER

It has been said that even good men and women remember God only in times of adversity and forget Him when the going is good. Such an attitude can be criticized as opportunistic. If we look at this a little more kindly it can well appear somewhat natural. When life is happy and carefree divine providence becomes unimportant in life. It is relevant even if not apparent. When individuals and groups face tragedies and travail they cry out to God for protection and support. This is because God is the refuge of those beaten down and in suffering. This explanation is not meant to defend any opportunistic attitude in this regard. It is just an explanation of a human problem.

In the early years of Indian independence, with Mahatma Gandhi gone, people in their exuberance of new-found freedom went nearly on forgetting the Master. There also came occasions when we not only deviated from the path he had indicated but even took pride in thinking that some of us were wiser than him. We do not wish to quarrel with what happened. When tragedies occurred and we were confronted with growing violence all around and the deepening of the gulf between the haves and have-nots, the memory of the Master began creeping back into our minds. We passed through moments of introspection. These were, however, short and fleeting and we sank back into renewed forgetfulness. This happened often in the last 25 years. But more than anyone else, two of India's greatest men after Gandhi, again and again recalled us to the basic values which had flowed from the life, work and death of Gandhi. These were Pandit Nehru and Acharya Vinoba. Their fields of action were utterly different from each other. But what they did was inimitable and in essence complementary. Pandit Nehru was the Prime Minister, concerned with government, the functions of government and, in spite of all difficulties, with finding for India a place in the modern world. Acharya Vinoba turned away completely from government and applied the strategy of nonviolence in a crucial field of economic trans-

formation, i.e. the voluntary redistribution of land among the landless millions. Land hunger has been at the root of many revolutions in the world and if India has not had a blood bath in this regard, we must bow our heads in reverence to that greatest of our sages who walked from one end of India to the other meeting millions of people face to face and pleading that those who had more land should part with some of it voluntarily to those who had no land at all. In any other country in the world such a silent revolution through consent would have been hailed as one of the miracles of history and any nation would have been proud of whatever was achieved in this regard. And yet the Bloodless-Revolution did not achieve its aim and became riddled with divisions and errors. Pandit Nehru, on the other hand, tried valiantly to build up an image of India still reflecting the moral and spiritual values of Gandhi in Indian politics, and at the same time to modernise the country. Pandit Nehru's herculean endeavour to rebuild Indian politics on such a firm and moral foundation achieved only partial success. Very few people have the capacity to consider the night-and-dayness of history. In the present case very few people are capable of thinking what would have happened in India without the vital and complementary leadership of both Acharya Vinoba and Pandit Nehru. People who just do nothing or have completely failed in the gandhian tasks they had undertaken, can easily throw stones at both Vinoba and Nehru. But this will not touch their essential greatness which will remain enshrined in history.

It is against this background that we shall make an attempt to assess some of the matters which confront India. The first thing that strikes like a terrific blow on our minds is the crisis of character which has overtaken almost every section of our people. The politician, the government servant, the industrialist, the labourer, the peasant and even the social and constructive worker have all come under this blight. It is enough to say that in the history of a nation the rise and fall of character follow like waves, one after the other, with imperative frequency. This will be poor consolation. Even at high levels, Indian politics has become terribly corrupt and shamelessly opportunistic. Political leaders who held on to vital foundations of moral values are still there on the Indian scene but they are few and far between. They have, however, failed to inhibit their followers with their own sense of integrity. What has happened in Andhra, in Bihar, in U.P. and Gujarat, are tragic reminders that political opportunism has infected all levels of the Congress. The gandhian era in Indian politics was almost wholly one of the politics of service. Even if Gandhi did not use the picturesque and magnificent phrases of Winston Churchill, he also made it clear that his politics were those of sweat, toil and suffering. He had nothing to offer to those who stood with him except the prison and the bullet—and yet



millions talked to his trumpet call, recking no consequence too dear in facing every challenge of brutality from the British who held India in subjection. Today politics has miserably become carrot-chasing by those greedy for any crumbs of power or money. There are many constitutional steps that can be taken to minimise political opportunism and chicanery. As for instance, the proposed legislation to prevent elected members from crossing the floor by making it imperative that such people should resign and seek a fresh verdict from the electorate. No member of any legislature crossing the floor should be rewarded with high office of any kind. We should make it clear beyond doubt that the nation will treat with contempt such 'ayazim and gyaanims'. Most of our political corruption stems from this basic depravity of those seeking power or money at any cost. It is not enough that our leaders furnish political leadership. They must also furnish moral leadership which the people will instinctively understand and value. There are only very few persons in the Congress today so hard up real mass contact and revealing to the people the challenges of social and constructive service. The political machinery is almost wholly that of vote-catching. When any political party reduces itself to a vote-catching machine it is a doomed party. While thus on the one hand political leaders of all parties have turned away from social and constructive work, constructive workers on the other hand have turned away completely from all political action. Both these attitudes are fatal. A way must be found to combine political and constructive work, taking all the necessary safeguards to prevent such unity of action degrading itself in the manner of present-day politics. On the one hand, we subject political leaders to every kind of inquisition and on the other let them play the devil with character and money. This is a strange paradox. On the one hand we attempt character examinations and on the other let many an evil deer get off with it. To completely divorce social and constructive work from political work is to hand over power to charlatans.

There are many other relevant matters to which one can refer. But we wish to stress in this essay the paramount need to face up to the present grave and alarming crisis of character. There are no easy remedies. Everyone must re-emphasise the politics of service without treating politics itself as dirt. Politics is only as dirty as we make it. The politics of Gandhi, Nehru, Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Chittaranjan Das, Lajpatrao and Rajag were not dirty politics but something which elevated and purified politics. Gandhi daringly used the phrase 'spiritualising politics', something unheard of till he arrived on the political scene. Some of our best leaders even while in politics must set the example of simple and high living and give genuine moral leadership. Authentic political leaders should join hands with authentic social and constructive

workers standing for truth and nonviolence in every sphere of action. We must rouse the people once again to bring together political action and service action, into an integrated national movement. It is not easy to draw up the blueprint of such a program. It is for us all however to give thought to this matter, confer together and arrive at high-minded and practical solutions.

© RAMACHANDRAN

## BEYOND DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

It is amazing how few of us understand the political implications of the technological revolution. International fetish words like *democracy* and *socialism* still sway our minds. Ideological fetters (using that word in the cinematic sense) still hold us in thrall. It's as though, for us, the world has come to a stand-still and all we need do is ring changes upon old and well-trodden themes!

The Symposium that follows this article is an attempt to jerk ourselves out of set grooves of thinking. Alas, the attempt has not proved an unqualified success. And the conviction has grown upon us that what this century needs most of all is a large measure of iconoclasm and heresy. Far too many sacred cows crowd upon our mental horizons, inhibiting and thwarting the natural impulse to truth and freedom. This is a calamity even more calamitous than the scarcities—food, water, power, jobs, houses, schools, hospitals (the list is endless)—and the warlike (like too many people and too many politicians!) that punctuate the staccato rhythm of our national life.

To anyone who is alive to the meaning of this last third of the twentieth century and is able to use his intellectual antennae to good purpose, democracy and socialism are no longer even the convenient pegs they once were. They are rather like the mantras that characterize a mind at the end of its tether or the revolutionary twitches that mark a deteriorating physique. As the tidal waves of the technological revolution engulf and overwhelm every commanding height of our political existence—and not even a King Canute can hope to command these waves!—they will wash away many things. Amidst the debris, as in past historic inundations, one will not have to search hard to find the remains of such ideology-turned-fetters as democracy and socialism.

The shape of things to come is already writ large everywhere. But there is such a thing as doctrinal myopia. We see and yet we do not perceive! Perhaps it is human, all too human, to cling to old illusions, to

imagine that somewhere in the past—which may be as recent as Marx or Mao or Gandhi or as ancient as Aristotle or Kapilya—we reached the final watershed of our thinking, and all we need do now is work out the details of that vision. This would indeed be true—too easily true—had the world not displayed a persistent and somewhat cantankerous tendency to change without warning. And this time—and we are not talking here of Buddhist metaphysics!—the sharpest reality is an otherwise blurred and out-of-focus world. It is our only beacon.

Technology is duly making nonsense of ideological postures, whether of the high-key or the low-key variety. In the thesis for the Symposium we have suggested a neutral-ground position that ventures to look beyond the familiar pulls and pushes of ideology. We thought we were in Gandhi a deep sensing of the natural evolution of man's collective political personality. We will not claim that he had worked out anything in very great detail, but he did show a remarkable awareness of the direction in which man must perforce travel if he is not to destroy himself too soon.

We lament that this direction is still so little understood in our country and that the incubation of ideology is taking us to a dead-end. In past ages, when time was more generous, one could learn things the hard way. Do we now have the time for such costly detours?

Why minor words? The world-wide trend towards autocracy and totalitarianism—of one hue or another, student or camouflaged—is unmistakable. For one ideology can breed only another ideology. And the two poles of any ideological spectrum look strangely alike! The obvious way out is to escape from the clutches of this fixed-back loop (as the computer jargon has it) and examine with a fresh pair of eyes the simple ingredients that make for good government—in the ultimate analysis, good *any* government. This is far, far beyond both democracy and socialism—or any combination of these—and goes to the roots of human ideology.

T. K. MABADHAN

# Democracy, socialism —and Gandhi

---

## A SYMPOSIUM

B. BHATTACHARYYA  
TRIDHA CHAUDHURI  
AMBITAMANDA DAS  
D. N. DAS GUPTA  
V. V. JOSE  
A. B. KRIPALANI  
B. C. MAHINDAR  
K. B. MALIKANI  
S. N. MEHA

HUDD HODD  
HIRSH HODDERJEE  
E. M. S. RAMAKRISHNAPAD  
SRISMAN SARAYAN  
V. S. NERLA  
M. C. BANERJEE  
A. B. BHANU  
RAHASI SUBRAMANYAM  
LOMESH THAKUR

## THE THESIS

- ☐ Ever since independence, India has been riding two horses at one and the same time—democracy and socialism. This equestrian feat has had its ups and downs. By and large, however, it's the democratic horse that had stolen the show, earning for us the not too enviable reputation of being the 'largest' democracy in the world. The socialist horse, with its torso relatively ill-defined, lurped behind.
- ☐ Lately all this has changed. The new Government, with a new rigging philosophy and determined to get teeth into its socialism, has begun willy nilly to nibble away at democracy, in the process raising a commotion in the house. It's now the democratic horse that's limping behind. Waddly awakened from 25 years of torpor eating, we panic at the sight.
- ☐ The moral is clear. Surprisingly, however, few in our country have shown signs of understanding it. Democracy and socialism are in-

comparables—however much we may juggle with catch-phrases like 'democratic socialism' and 'socialist democracy'. They cannot coexist without the one crowding into the other. They cannot be blended into one concoction except in a highly diluted form.

- If we want full-blooded socialism—any other socialism is a hoax anyway—we must be willing to make deep compromises with our democratic inheritance. On the other hand, if we want to keep our democracy unaltered—indeed, make it much more of a living thing—we must be willing to give up our socialist experiment. We just can't bestride both the horses without sooner or later falling off our perch and exposing ourselves to universal ridicule.
- That is essence is India's present and continuing dilemma. All the rest of the argument—independent judiciary, free press and what not—is wide of the mark.
- Gandhi perceived this dilemma long ago when he put forward the trans-ideological alternative. He was a man who swore neither by democracy nor by socialism, being, at best, a half-hearted democrat and a reluctant socialist. Taking doctrinaire positions was not his idea of nation building. Gandhi's 'truth'—the basis of his political philosophy—was no dogma but the substance that responds creatively to changing reality.
- Which way then shall India steer her ship of state? Towards socialism? Towards democracy? Or shall we avoid both Scylla and Charybdis and give Gandhi's trans-ideological alternative a second look?

T. K. MARATHAN

## THE DEBATE

### *Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya*

The alternatives are not democracy and socialism. The historic choice before us today is: capitalism or socialism? Any student of contemporary Indian polity may probably ask himself one question, namely, *why* *now*. What is the class which benefited most from the political transformation in August 1947? Who constitute the ruling class in the sovereign democratic republic of India?

The Indian state is a capitalist state. Espousing the principles of private property, the Government promotes the nation socialism. The political system developed during last twenty-five years does not respond to the hopes and aspirations of the masses of our people. The country is nowhere near realising the humanitarian dreams of Gandhi, not only

because it is not possible to reverse the process of history, but also because the humanism urges that lay behind Gandhi's utopia did never appeal to the powers that be.

The Constitution, by guaranteeing bourgeois property rights, acquired the character of a bourgeois constitution. And the state, elaborated in harmony with the basic principle of the Constitution, logically became a bourgeois state.

One should not ignore the basic social truth that the economic and political life of capitalist societies is *primarily* determined by the relationship, born of the capitalist mode of production, between the class on the one hand which owns and controls and the working class and toiling masses on the other. In fact, the political process in capitalist societies is mainly about the confrontation of these forces, and is intended to sanction the relationship between them. And India is no exception to this general pattern.

India opted for a political form familiarly described as simply 'democratic', which in essence is 'bourgeois democratic'. Democracy is not static, uniform or fixed but a *dynamic*, diversified, changing product of socio-economic development. Hence the need for qualifying the democratic form by its essential social content.

Whatever its merits, bourgeois democracy does not give the decision-making powers to the majority but functions as a screen for the domination of capital.

Contemporary capitalism has been betraying all the features of liberal democracy. And Indian capitalism being a part of international capitalism, and more so because of the compulsions of its underdeveloped (graphematically called developing) nature, is on the way to manipulating its democratic forms. As a matter of fact, democracy has been honoured more in its violation than in its protection and expansion. The democracy of the past was tied up with the advancement of capitalism. Now that its achievements are threatened by the retrogression of capitalism, the prospects of democracy are inseparably linked to the struggle for socialist revolution which will bring the masses to power.

Revolutionary socialism and genuine democracy are not disjunctive propositions. The question is not that of making a choice between democracy and socialism but that of replacing the existing system by a superior type of democracy which will enable the producers of wealth to control their lives and livelihoods and expand their freedoms. That can only be a socialist democracy in the authentic sense of the term, and not, of course, in its Stalinist-bureaucratic perverted version.

**Tridib Chaudhuri**

The apparent dichotomy between democracy and socialism and their

mutual exclusiveness have their origin in our habit of understanding democracy in terms of 'bourgeois' democracy. 'Bourgeois' democracy implies a concept of politics based on certain inalienable democratic rights for the citizen which, however, do not transgress the absolute limits set by the rights of private property. Other fundamental rights, rights of personal freedom, freedom of conscience, rights to free expression (freedom of press and speech), freedom of movement, assembly and profession, the right of every citizen to secure lawful redress against any violation of these guaranteed rights in a court of law, the so-called independence of the judiciary, equality of all citizens before the eyes of the law etc., all follow from and revolve round the sacrosanct and inalienable right of private property. The owner of private property cannot be deprived of his property or disturbed in the pursuit of lawfully augmenting his property—that is the fundamental principle of 'bourgeois' democracy, except for such violations or partial violations of that principle as are called for in the collective interest of the class of private property owners as such.

But it does not at all imply that every citizen is a property-owner. The right to own and dispose of one's property as one likes is a right guaranteed only for owners of property. Propertyless people, the have-nots, do not have that right. But they have other rights, the freedom of opinion and expression, the right to vote for electing their representatives to the legislature, right to a representative and responsible government (responsible, that is, to their elected representatives) and so on. But they do not have any legally guaranteed right to work, employment and adequate livelihood. The directive principles of state policy in the Indian Constitution declare these things to be desiderata. But they are not legally enforceable. Bourgeois democracy as ordinarily understood is based on the freedom of the individual and that of the individual property-owner. It does not protect or guarantee the rights of employment or livelihood. But it invariably protects the rights of property-owning citizens to own, augment, enjoy and dispose of their property. The fundamental right of private property naturally includes the right to inherit and bequeath property as well as dispose of it by sale or gift. No one, neither private persons nor the state, can deprive the property-owning citizen of that right. The logical consequences following from this have taken shape in the acquisitive society of modern capitalist democracies.

As private property exists in the so-called democratic societies of our day in the dominant form of capitalist private property and as the modern acquisitive society, based on capitalist private property and industrial technology, requires a considerable degree of regulation and mutual adjustment of interests between competitive capitalist groups (within the country as well as outside), the need to curb and even transgress the rights of some owners of property, in order to safeguard the

collective interest of all or the majority of private property owners (particularly those of the dominant sections), has come to be recognised as an unavoidable necessity in all modern capitalist democracies these days. These restrictions or curbs take the form of state capitalism or, to use the Leninist terminology, state monopoly capitalism.

Modern socialism, call it 'full-blooded' socialism if you like, primarily implies a five-fold principle of social organisation which basically contradicts the 'bourgeois' concept of democracy, viz. (1) a negation of the sacrosanctness (i.e. of the inviolability) of the right of private property; (2) the principle of collective social ownership of all sources of wealth and production through the state or otherwise (through other forms of collective or cooperative social organisations), (3) planned social production for the satisfaction of social needs instead of private profit; (4) recognition of the principle that nobody shall be entitled to a share of social wealth or to an enjoyment thereof, as of right, by virtue of his private ownership of the means of production without taking part in socially necessary labour (cf. the Biblical principle: 'He who shall not work, neither shall he eat'), and lastly (5) effective democratic control over the state and over the collective organs of society by the common citizens (all of whom would be 'citizen-workers' who would actively participate in the process of social labour according to their capacity).

The apparent contradiction between democracy (as traditionally understood) and socialism with which we are confronted today cannot be resolved if, in the first place, we are not prepared to free our notion of democracy from its visible and invisible moorings in private property. The new Congress Government under the leadership of Mrs Gandhi has been intensely caught in the web of this contradiction because of the inhibitions placed on its mode of thinking by the traditional concept of democracy based on private property. We must not forget that the sacrosanctness of the rights of private property is recognised as an inalienable fundamental right in the basic law of the land, namely, the Constitution of India. Recent amendments of the Constitution made by the new Parliament have not changed the position in that regard except modifying the legal right to receive compensation at the market rate for private property taken over by the State. The latest Supreme Court decisions in constitutional amendment cases (25th and 26th amendments) have again reinforced the inalienable character of the rights of private property and the Government is bound by it. But that apart, the Prime Minister has repeatedly declared that neither she nor her Government has any intention to abolish private property or its rights, they only seek to restrict it, where required, for subserving the common good. Obviously they have failed to make up their mind as to how much of socialism and how much of democracy they want to realise, they wear by both.

As a result the Government wobbles between its vote-catching popu-



but slogans about democracy and socialism without ensuring and practising either consistently. What it actually practises inevitably tends to degenerate into selling state monopoly-capitalism over certain vital strategic sectors of the national economy in the name of socialism. Really speaking, its policies do not have the remotest connection with authentic socialism while at every step it goes on violating even the formal rule of bourgeois democracy about individual freedom and civic liberties in the interest of its authoritarian one-party rule, which eventually serves to promote the interest of a favoured group of capitalists and monopolists.

Those who believe in the basic human values represented by democracy should, in the first place, try to formulate a truly democratic structure of society unshackled in any manner by the restrictions of private property. The concept of democracy, based on the ideas of essential human freedom (as embodied in the inalienable civic freedoms of person, opinion and expression, freedom of movement, freedom to seek legal redress for one's rights, independence of judiciary etc.) and sanctity of the human personality, can be immeasurably enriched if it is rid of its traditional association with the rights of private property as these have developed historically over last three centuries.

The championing of the right of private property as a fundamental right does not mean that all private property has to be abolished or liquidated at a stroke. Such forms of private property as small-peasant property or the property of self-employed persons in industry or that of small owners employing a limited number of workers, may be permitted till such time as the society (i.e. the state) is ready to bring them under appropriate forms of collective or cooperative social organization, if these subserve the common good. The criterion here is entirely pragmatic, based on practical or empirical considerations. If any form of private property is allowed to exist for some time, it must not be at the expense of basic human values or transgress the democratic rights of the common man, the common-workers.

Here it is that Gandhi's non-doctrinaire and empirical humanistic approach can help us immensely. I dislike describing Gandhi's approach as 'trans-ideological'. I have always understood Gandhism as *essentially humanistic*, based on the recognition of the sacredness of the human personality and his concept of democratic freedom as the essential precondition under which the human personality can attain its fullest development. As to his method, it is the purely practical or empirical one of securing human freedom and the fulfilment of the human personality, which were his categorical imperatives. I see no reason why this approach should be inhibited or bound in any manner by ingrained notions about the irrevocability of private property. If Gandhi never brought himself consciously to deny the rights of private property and

ever wanted the capitalists as a class to regard themselves as 'castes' for the labourers and the poor, it is equally true that he never regarded the rights of property or wealth to be inviolable. That to my mind is the superiority of his empirical humanist approach.

Gandhi's is surely not the historical or sociological approach of the class-struggle socialist. But it is by no means 'trans-ideological'. It follows from the basic ideology of eternal humanism and furnishes the unerring guideline for Gandhi's 'truth'. Regarded from this point of view Gandhi's approach can help us to resolve the current contradiction between the notions of democracy and socialism. But it will require a radical departure from the traditionally accepted notions of democracy and socialism.

I for one see no reason why socialism should contradict democracy or vice versa. As a matter of fact there can be no socialism without democracy, as Lenin said, provided that we do not equate democracy with private property. Gandhi's basic humanism would help us to salvage democracy from its traditional association with private property, to realize authentic humanist democracy on the higher plane of socialism and, last but not the least, to humanize socialism and rid it of the vice of totalitarian collectivism which seeks to crush and pulverize the human individual and its uniqueness.

### *Amritananda Das*

It has been my feeling, for quite some time now, that it is misleading to concern the dilemmas of practical policy facing this country as a choice between 'socialism' and 'democracy'. The reason for this feeling is that both 'socialism' and 'democracy' are second-order goals, i.e., they are not ends in themselves but seek to realize certain ideals. Clarity of thinking is promoted by concentrating on these fundamental ideals rather than on the secondary goals of socialism and democracy.

Primarily, to my mind, 'socialism' is valued as a tool for realizing a non-exploitative (fraternal) society in which economic power is not used to the public detriment. Similarly, when we talk of 'democracy' what we really wish to secure is the responsiveness of public policy to mass opinion and the protection of the fundamental rights of the individual. Consequently, the three fundamental goals on which we need to concentrate are:

- A. protection of the fundamental rights of the individual,
- B. responsiveness of public policy to mass opinion; and
- C. laying the foundations of a non-exploitative socio-economic order.

Once we visualize our goals as above, the following things become quite clear. First, by setting up a highly centralized politico-administra-

new system we have put public policy effectively beyond the reach of the people. It is only through restructuring the politico-administrative order on the basis of rigorous decentralisation that the popular will can be given a chance to manifest itself.

Secondly, the same tendency towards centralised administration of the ordinary business of life of the citizenry inevitably creates a milieu in which *more and more arbitrary power* is demanded by the administration in order to discharge effectively the *duties which have been assigned to it*. Under such a condition, there can be no serious attempt to protect the fundamental rights of the individual.

Finally, we have adopted an elitist scheme of development based on the unrealistic hope of material affluence on a mass basis. The actual operation of this modernisation-industrialisation drive is to merely strengthen the hands of the elite and to put into their hands more and more power to exploit the 'mass'.

The remedy is obvious. We must orient our development strategy towards a post-modern society and recognise that such a society will be based on the ideal of need limitation, equal sharing, small use of operations and a stress on eco-technic balance. Once these aims are fully accepted the need for centralisation of economic and political power will disappear. It will then be possible to fully implement the ideal of communitarian democracy within a broad national legal framework guaranteeing fundamental rights to the individual.

It, therefore, appears that the basic ideals which socialism and democracy stand for are being destroyed in this country because we are concentrating on outer form and not inner essence. These same ideals can be simultaneously pursued only on the basis of the thorough acceptance of:

- A. a decentralised political order based on communitarian democracy,
- B. commitment towards a post-modern socio-economic order based on need limitation, ecological balance and appropriate (sane) technology, and
- C. a realisation that the pursuit of power-centralisation in the hands of the administration is incompatible with the maintenance of the liberty of the individual.

As will be amply clear, these insights are also fundamentally the same as those which Gandhi had attained. In this sense it remains true that only an understanding of Gandhi's thought can rescue us from the present confusions and traps errors.

*D N. Dangi*

Those who declare that democracy is incompatible with socialism may

ask themselves a question: Is democracy compatible with the latest false theory that that government is best which governs the least? Is the state to be only a policeman to protect the bank vaults and keep the burglars away? The marriage between democracy and capitalism has never been pleasant, contrary to the belief of those who grope at the very margins of socialism.

Socialist measures—I believe there are quite a number of them to be distinguished from full-blooded socialism and all of which involve greater intervention by the state in the economic sphere—have to be seen as the necessary deterrents to check wayward capitalism. Keynes was no socialist, but he knew that democracy cannot survive, not to speak of thriving, if social welfare measures are not undertaken by the state, if public finance is not given more place in the economic life. The Great Depression of 1929 killed the myth that capital has its own checks and controls. Roosevelt was no socialist, but he was a democrat who made adjustments with the post-depression economics and brought in the New Deal.

I think the mistake occurs when we assume that democracy is the political version of free enterprise. Democracy as a way of life, as a pattern of thinking, is wide enough to encompass a great variety of economic theories. That alone explains why Mao insists on calling his adaptation of Leninism New Democracy. Many sociologists have described the Cultural Revolution as an experiment in mass democracy. Similarly, democratic socialism is not an empty shell, but a viable and significant step towards finding a balance between the individual and society, between freedom and coercion. Those who decry state interference in industry—from the Industrial Policy announcement in 1956 to the current take-over of food-grains trade—may as well ask why the U.S. Government undertook anti-monopoly legislation (the Taft Act) in the 'thirties or why the Federal Bank in that country is run by the Government. All the more reason why our economy, which still lacks the vigour and glow of risk-taking, adventurous capitalism, should call for state direction.

The crux of the matter is that if we cannot manage to bring together democracy and socialism, if, through legislative and peaceful means, we cannot remove the evils of economic disparity and concentration of social power, the alternative will not be out-throat capitalism but what Mr Mahadevan calls full-blooded socialism.

Then quite a lot of blood is likely to flow, quite a number of heads are likely to roll. This is no nightmarish fancy, but a real possibility. The vast majority of Indians are impatient with a system that consistently cheats them of even a meal a day. Full-blooded socialism is likely to fascinate them. Democrats have to see to it that their dignity is shared by all others. So the process of socialism, I

think, should be hastened and not slowed down. Time is running out.

One word about Gandhi's position vis-a-vis the debate. Gandhi's economic thought, it is no use denying, was determined by the colonial status of India and its present relevance is a matter of dispute. Decentralisation, accent on a self-sufficient village economy and disregard of industrialisation do not add up to a viable economic system for an underdeveloped country in desperate need of reconstruction. And the Gandhian concept of a trusteeship of capitalists has been betrayed by that class, who do not even clear their income tax data. It is their collectivism, their absolute unconcern, their conspicuous display of wealth and vulgarity that invite state control. The commanding heights of the economy, it is justifiably felt, cannot any more be left to their control.

*P. V. John*

One way to discuss the problems of our polity is to deal with them in terms of the concentration or distribution of power, political, economic and social.

Lincoln's designation of democracy as government of the people, by the people, for the people, is perennially valid; it indicated the source of authority in the democratic state and the objectives of the exercise of that authority. It is however necessary to add that it is of the essence of the democratic faith that there should be no concentration of power, political, economic or social, in any agency or group or person in the state, not even in a majority of the citizens. In other words, democracy attempts the delicate and difficult task of seeking the common good, through reconciling the will of a majority of the people with the inalienable rights of the individual, such as are invoked in the opening lines of the Indian Constitution, namely, justice, freedom and equality.

In regard to the quality of its judgement, a democracy may claim no more than that 'more than half of the people are right more than half of the time'. A system based on so modest a claim would provide for freedom of dissent, and would be clearheaded enough to acknowledge the lesson of history that great ideas almost invariably begin as minority ideas, and the welfare of the human race has often depended on the chances these ideas have had of winning due attention.

It is one of the wonders of democratic life that the secrets of freedom sometimes emerge not only from among a minority of ideologists, who but for the freedom they demand would themselves suffer persecution, unless they plan to do the persecution themselves. In the face of widespread poverty and suffering, we are asked to choose economic well-being in preference to a freedom that amounts to no more than the freedom of the many to starve and of a few to exploit. In situations

of despotism, it is not easy for people to see that those who surrender freedom in the search for economic security may end by having neither freedom nor security. A benevolent tyranny might conceivably provide economic security, but neither the benevolence nor the security is guaranteed over any length of time. And when the security vanishes, or even fails to arrive, the trustful people who surrendered freedom in the expectation of economic well-being, are left with no resource other than rebellion or assassination. Democracy, which sometimes covers the efficiency that despotism achieves in the pursuit of desirable objectives, has one supreme quality that despotism does not have, a quality that puts it above other patterns of governance, namely, the capacity for self-correction. This process is often slow and may drive people to despair. One of the tasks of democracy is to speed up this self-correcting process.

There are two widely divergent concepts of socialism that have both found adherents in our country; their true quality may be judged from their divergent approaches to the ideals of democracy. Those who define socialism as the common ownership of the means of production, which in practical terms means the state monopoly of economic power, react to the slowness or inefficiency of the democratic process by wanting to seize such power and achieve their objectives through the assumption of absolute power. There is however another school of socialism that disapproves of the concentration of economic power either in the hands of individuals or in those of the state, and seeks an equitable distribution of wealth such as is envisaged in Articles 38 and 39 of the Indian Constitution. It is confusing that these divergent approaches to the building of a social order should be known by the same label, namely, socialism. The confusion however suits the former variety of socialism, for it is part of his strategy that until absolute power comes into the hands of his party, he should continue to claim that socialism is a dynamic concept in need of a continuing process of redefinition, and that, as of now, socialism means the equitable distribution of economic power, and to achieve this, all he would ask for is a certain abridgement of the freedoms of the liberal democratic process. The trustful citizen may not discover until it is too late that it is easier to harness freedom than to harness poverty.

The enemies of freedom come from both extremes. One consists of those who sling the promise of freedom and exploit the freedom of the democratic system for self-aggrandisement. This leads inevitably to the stance of the other extreme that would view freedom as an impediment to the attainment of a just social order. Democracy does not have to choose between these two perverse views of freedom. The freedom on which democracy subsists is inseparable from the other values that are involved along with it in the promise to the Indian Constitu-

tion, namely, justice, equality and fraternity. These values are indispensable constituents of a just social order. Advancement to them, however, is not a matter of slogans or gimmicks, it means hard work and unrelenting vigilance. It also means self-fulfilment.

### *J.B. Kripalani*

When in 1947 India achieved its independence, it was only a partial political change, because the voter in our democracy lacked the necessary political education and awareness. The economic and social conditions did not change. The poverty and unemployment of the masses did not end, or even diminish, by the transfer of power to Indian hands. In the social field there was no change. It was a caste- and class-ridden society.

The basic policies and programs of the Congress before independence were laid down by Gandhi. They were conceived in terms of the factual conditions existing in the country. As these conditions remained the same, the same remedies should have been applied. Why were they not?

It was because Congress politicians in general did not understand Gandhi's comprehensive plans and programs. The socialists of those days described Gandhi as a reactionary, a friend of the capitalists and, therefore, of the imperialists. The more charitable among them afterwards described him as a revivalist. Leaving aside the socialists, the Swagists could not understand him either. Even leading Congressmen failed in this respect. Jawaharlal ridiculed spinning as an 'old dame's work'. As late as 1938, in an exchange of letters with Gandhi, Jawaharlal wrote:

'You know how intensely I have admired you and believe in you . . . I have done so in spite of the fact that I hardly agreed with anything that some of your previous publications—*Indian Home Rule*, etc.—contain . . . If we are to win . . . all Khadi becomes universal in India, we shall have to wait all the Greek Kalends . . . in an article . . . you gave some newspaper cuttings from America about crime and immorality and contrasted American civilization with India. I felt it was something like Catherine Mayo drawing conclusions from some unrepresentative hospital statistics . . . You have stated somewhere that India has nothing to learn from the West and that she had reached a pinnacle of wisdom in the past. I entirely disagree with this viewpoint and I neither think that the so-called Rama Raj was very good in the past nor do I want it back . . . You have advanced very eloquently and forcefully the claims of dandamayana . . . I do believe that the remedy you have suggested is very helpful to them . . . But I doubt very much if the fundamental

causes of poverty are touched by it. You do not say a word against the semi-feudal zamindari system . . . or against the capitalist exploitation of both the workers and the consumers." (*Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Vol. 3, pp. 14-15)

Whether Jawaharlal was properly interpreting Gandhi or not, the fact remains that this was his understanding of him. Such was, and is, the understanding of Gandhi and his program by the intellectuals.

Congressmen in general were concerned only with the narrow political problem of the removal of foreign imperial rule. They supported the rest of Gandhi's program as a concession to his dynamic political leadership in the freedom fight. Gandhi accepted them, as he often said, as he had to work with the material he had. He could mould it only slightly.

As against this, what were Gandhi's ideas about the reconstruction of the country after independence? In order to understand this it is necessary to study the method of Gandhi's work. He was not an academician. He was not a theoretician. He did not work out his plans and programs in a library. He did not write learned theses about them. He tackled factual problems confronting the country and its people, in a practical and pragmatic manner. Theory was arrived at as a consequence of results obtained. It did not precede practice and experiment.

For instance, 80 per cent of the Indian masses live in villages on agriculture, with the land divided into small holdings. Mills and factories could not be established under foreign rule. Even if they could, they would not have provided work for the millions of unemployed and the semi-employed. They had to be provided with work in the villages, to supplement their meagre earnings from their tiny plots of land. What could be a more convenient instrument of production for them than the charkha? It has no preconceived theory to support it!

Political problems too were to be tackled factually. The old panchayat system had provided effective local self-government to the villagers. It had almost been destroyed by the centralized foreign government, yet its traditions were alive. The ignorant masses, knowing their own needs, could work it. On this Panchayat Raj as the base was to be built the all-India structure of democracy. Gandhi wanted to build from below upwards, not from the top to the base. In social matters too, Gandhi was pragmatic. Unless there was Hindu-Muslim unity, he propheticly said that rivers of blood would flow, as they have been flowing even after independence. Untouchability is a great and festering wound in the body politic. Its removal would also remove the caste-system among the Hindus.

So also, other problems in India were tackled by Gandhi on practical and pragmatic bases. Every scheme of reform was based on the existing condition. There was no preconceived theory of socialism or



any other man behind any of his schemes.

The only basic principles he pointed to were truth and nonviolence. And it is on these that democracy is based. These virtues are also necessary for international peace.

Gandhi's views about democracy were his own. They do not imply an isolated individual living like Robinson Crusoe on a solitary island, but a social individual, who is born, lives and has his being in society. Therefore, he must live within a social discipline. Even his salvation can only be achieved in society and not in a cave or on a mountain top. Therefore did Gandhi hold that rights flow from duties fulfilled. There can be no rights antecedent to duties, which by their nature are social.

From the above it will be seen that Gandhi in working for the removal of poverty did not think in terms of an undefined and undefinable "socialism". His ideas about democracy implied the social individual. We call him the Father of the Nation. Why? Because he knew the pulse of the nation and its requirements more than any other past or present leader. In the reforms he advocated, he had indicated pioneer work under the handicaps of foreign rule. He expected his pioneer efforts to be pushed forward and to cover the country after Swaraj. To the extent we have failed in this, we have been unable to solve the national problems a quarter of a century after independence.

### *R.C. Majumdar*

Since the achievement of independence the Government of India has professed to follow the twofold policy of democracy and socialism, sometimes called socialistic pattern, the exact meaning or nature of which still remains a mystery. Events have shown that these two are incompatible and that combining them has been the cause of almost all the woes from which the country has been suffering.

The democracy professed by the Government has proved to be nothing but rank autocracy under a thinly veiled disguise of outer form. The main cause of this was the decision to start with adult franchise in a country where about three-fourths of the population are illiterate and the remaining have no familiarity with the truly democratic form of government. Be it remembered that even in the United Kingdom, generally known as the mother of democracies, adult franchise was not introduced till 1911.

Comparable to this is the immediate starting of a number of heavy industries in a country which had little training in that line. In both cases, India was made to run before it learnt to walk.

The net result is that Free India never enjoyed the blessings of either democracy or socialism, but suffered from the evils of both. This may be illustrated by a few facts and views which I have been able to

gather from the writings of eminent authorities on the subject.

'The achievements of India's five year plans are hardly proportionate to the investment in the many projects. The public sector, so called, does not show a picture of business efficiency or public responsibility. With a few exceptions the public sector undertakings present a dismal scene of waste, inefficiency and corruption. The dream of a socialistic pattern of society has rapidly faded leaving in its trail frustration and conflict.' The cause of this is explained by another authority as follows. 'We have neither freedom in the private sector, corresponding to what took place in the U.K. and the U.S. in the early stages of economic growth, nor freedom in the public sector, corresponding to what has been taking place in recent decades in the communist states. On the other hand, we have restraints on public entrepreneurs because of political freedom and democracy, and restraints on the private sector because of the freedom of association of workers and labour legislation.'<sup>1</sup>

How the causes of failure are inherent in the system of nationalisation has been explained by another eminent authority by drawing attention to its obvious defects, namely, 'lack of competition and the absence of urgent need for diversification, improvement and discovery of new technical know-how', which make it stagnant and unprogressive.'<sup>2</sup>

The same writer further observes 'One inevitable consequence of establishing state monopolies is to elevate the power of monopoly trade unions against them. If you run a strike against a nationalised industry, it will usually be something like 100 per cent effective, because nobody can break the strike by stepping up production in competing firms with blacklegs or non-union labour.'<sup>3</sup> The sooner the Government of India realises that nationalisation and the right to strike are incompatible, the better for our already impoverished country.

Another grave defect in the system is that ultimate control over these undertakings is vested in senior officials, often having neither experience nor youthful energy to adapt themselves to the changing circumstances, which require free thinking and the capacity for bold decisions.

The communist countries enforce discipline by ruthless measures against workers, but this is not possible for a so-called democratic government which has to depend upon trade-unions for votes at the next election. This subservency has generated a spirit of silent contempt

1. S. F. Agar, *The Commonwealth in South Asia*, p. 237.

2. *Freedom and Development* (published by India International Centre), pp. 42-44.

3. An article by Mr Norman Macrae, Deputy Editor of the *Evening Standard* in its issue of April 24-May 4, 1971.

4. *Ibid.*

for law and order in every section of public life which is eating into the vitals of national life. The events of last ten years all over India confirm the common belief that only organized violence or prolonged strikes will compel the Government to accept the demands pressed upon them. This belief or spirit is no longer confined to industrial workers but has spread to all sections of society, including students, teachers, and employees of the Government and of semi-governmental institutions like banks. This morning's papers refer to the violent actions of a body of teachers and the firing by the police to check them, which caused an uproar in the Legislative Assembly of Assam. The most serious development in the growing lawlessness and violence in the country is the emergence of students as a pressure group not only in academic but also in political matters. A certain University in Bengal has been forced to accept students as investigators in examinations where almost universal copying is the order of the day. Another University in Bengal has agreed to appoint student representatives on its administrative bodies. The latest instance of the influence exercised by students on the actual administration of the country is afforded by the struggle between two organizations of students in Bengal, both belonging to the Congress party, which is causing great concern to the Chief Minister of West Bengal, if not also to the Prime Minister of India.

The nature of the severe disease which is afflicting the body politic is not much in doubt. The question of quackery is the remedy. Mr Mahadewan has suggested that we should try the remedy propounded by Mahatma Gandhi, 'who swore neither by democracy nor by socialism but whose basis of political philosophy was "truth"—no dogma but the resilience that responds creatively to changing reality'. Unfortunately, as an ordinary man like me, not infused into the essence of gandhian philosophy, his 'non-ideological alternative', to which we are asked to give a trial, does not convey any concrete idea of thought or action. We must have a more definite scheme, ideal and line of action before the common people may judge of its full implication and make their choice.

### *K. R. Malkani*

I quite disagree with the thesis that India has been riding two horses at one and the same time—democracy and socialism—and that in the earlier stage democracy stole the show and socialism lagged behind and now socialism is becoming a fact and democracy is receding. We have never had much of a democracy and we don't have any socialism.

On less than 50 per cent votes, the Congress has been securing 75 per cent seats and exercising 100 per cent power. And for most of the time the Congress has been a one-man or one-woman show. As for socialism,

the less and the better. There is even less socialism in the 'socialist' budgets of Indira Gandhi and Y. B. Chavan than there was in the 'reactionary' budgets of T. T. Krishnamachari and Morarji Deas. In democracy, as in socialism, we have the form and not the substance—the husk and not the grain.

Actually democracy and socialism are not only not incompatible, they are two sides of the same coin. Socialism is economic democracy, democracy is political socialism. The two can not only go together, they have got to go together—if either of them is to materialise at all.

Democratic socialism is a living fact in Western Europe and Japan. It can be a fact in India too. The biggest single reason why the possible is not yet the actual, is the general backwardness of the country. As long as this backwardness continues, everything that we do will be backward. Today our democracy is backward and so is our capitalism. Our socialism if, as and when it comes, will also be a backward socialism. I should not be surprised that, if we ever have a dictator, it will be a backward dictatorship. These are the politico-economic compulsions of a backward country.

It is easy enough to talk of Gandhism as the panacea for all our ills, but Gandhism did not prevail even during the life-time of Gandhi, and since his death, it has definitely been on the retreat. On issues after issues, whether it is food control or birth control, prohibition or language, the Government of India has been a monument to anti-Gandhi. But we are yet to hear a voice of gandhian protest against it all.

It is possible that after a couple of centuries, Gandhi will be re-discovered and Gandhism will be given a serious trial. It has happened before. Christianity didn't come into its own till a few centuries after Christ. Even Buddhism did not come into its own till the emergence of Ashoka, three centuries later. It is, therefore, quite possible that, after a prolonged period of trial and error, this country—and, maybe, many other countries—will re-discover Gandhi. But till then we seem to be condemned to our present purgatory wherein each solution seems to be only worse than the previous one. The only consolation is that by this process of rejection, 'non-sens', we will hopefully arrive at a more valuable and a longer lasting solution.

*S.N. Mirra*

Nobody can honestly deny the fact that the freedom of India was hastened and won by Mahatma Gandhi. It is thus unfortunate that those who inherited the fruits of independence have today completely and unhesitatingly left behind his ideas and ideals for selfish reasons.

In 25 years of independence, it is on account of the disregard which we have shown for the gandhian philosophy that, in spite of whatever

we could do, we Congressmen are today in such misery, distress and downright disgrace. I know I am saying nothing new. Tulsidas said it centuries ago:

darjuna jhu hadhat pavit,  
prathama: hat uchi sibi rasat.

"Do a good turn to an evil man and he will, far from thanking you, recompense your destruction!"

For the prosperity of our country, I believe the following five fundamental principles provide the strongest foundation: (1) Prayer, (2) Peace, (3) Purity, (4) Piety, and (5) Production. I am assured that our leaders have ignored each one of them. Therefore is our search for prosperity a cry in the wilderness.

**PRAYER.** This has become a taboo, in the name of secularism, as if secularism has no obligation to the Creator. Its absence has killed and blackened our conscience.

**PEACE.** In spite of Mahatma Gandhi's having laid down his life for peace, our present leaders seem to believe that they should be traders rather than secure peace for the people of the country by devoting themselves to law and order.

**PURITY.** This is now a rarity. No administrator in the country has thought of tackling the problem, so that today purity cannot be found either high up or low down. All efforts and suggestions made by others never meet with the approval of those who should restore purity. God alone knows where we will be headed.

**PIETY.** This is a basic foundation of secularism, but in actual practice the difference between the lowest and the highest in this country is anything between 1 and 100 per cent. The majority of the Government and the bureaucrats are alone responsible for this state of affairs.

**PRODUCTION.** Affluence is possible only when there is a high rate of production. But the interest of the Government seems to be in controls, and controls at every stage. This has killed the enthusiasm in the producer and scarcity conditions prevail in each and every section of our economic life. Thus even the fifth fundamental principle of Mahatma Gandhi has been crushed in actual practice.

I can only pray to the Almighty to give wisdom to those that are arrogant, awakening to those in slumber and repentance to those who claim to follow Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy. Even at this stage, we can save the country from chaos, destruction and revolution.

### *Piloo Mody*

I am delighted to read Mr Mahadevan's thesis because it so accurately reflects my own feelings. As a matter of fact this has been my bone of contention with my friend, the Pakistan President, Mr Shatto, and

it is my constant argument with all radicals and socialists who are pseudo-democrats and all democrats who are pseudo-radicals and socialists. There is no doubt that the former have willingly used the latter and the latter have capitalized on the strength of the former. Whichever way you look at it, the unholy alliance has dragged the country away from the path laid down in the Constitution into the wilderness of anarchy. In the process a new language had to be invented in which the words come from English, but the thoughts emanate from those who wish to deceive, confuse and ultimately paralyse.

Socialism is an economic theory which glorifies the state at the cost of the individual, and democracy is a system designed to protect the individual from the state. Only Nehruvian logic, Mrs Indira Gandhi's cleverness and the dexterity of the Congress Party could even attempt to sell a concept like Democratic Socialism. To a very large extent that has been the basis of arbitrary rule in India, with our rulers claiming to be democratic when they did not wish to do a thing and socialist when they wanted to trample on the rights of the people. Fortunately they have been found out. One cannot say whether it has been a day too soon or a day too late. But one thing is certain that those who swore by Democratic Socialism have lost their zest for democracy; and now it is a question of touch and go whether the system will triumph or these evil forces which made a mockery out of it.

### *Hiren Mukerjee*

Mr Mahadevan has, with his 'eyes and ears open' (to quote his deliberate words), chosen to let loose a piece of polemic which, with all due respect, seems to me to be totally contrary to Gandhi's thinking and practice.

History is never easy to make—a truth of life which Gandhi fully understood and kept in mind. One step was often enough for Gandhi, but even as he took it he never took his eyes off the goal. Not being prone to intellectual analysis, he was careful of keeping away from long-term, ideological formulations. As Mr Mahadevan says, he was not 'dogmatic', but he was, always, to the best of his understanding, *principled*. Whatever programs and policies he put forward were never what Mr Mahadevan expressively and pectusquely dubs as the 'trans-ideological alternative' to such concepts as democracy and socialism.

To Mr Mahadevan, unhappily, there seems to exist an insurmountable dichotomy between 'socialism' and 'democracy'. With his pleasant knack of coining words, he would have made Gandhi chuckle at the description of him as 'at best a half-hearted democrat and a reluctant socialist'. One fact, however, that Gandhi was the sort of person who would never be a reluctant whatever-have-you, nor would he expound

something to which he gave only half his heart. He was too sure of his faith and of himself—which, indeed, was the secret of his strength. And he claimed, entirely truthfully as far as he was concerned, that he was more genuinely socialist than others who claimed the label and of course a truer democrat than many who wore the appellation. In his own way—which may not and need not necessarily be ours today—he had found the organic link between the two concepts in the real life of peoples.

Addressing in Ahmedabad the judge who tried him for his leadership of the non-cooperation struggle (March 1922), Gandhi used words that cannot be erased from the mind of whoever heard or read them. 'The government of British India is carried on for the exploitation of the masses. The miserable little comforts of the town-dwellers in India represent the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, and the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence presented by the skeletons that one sees in the Indian villages. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers in India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unparalleled in history.'

There may be a few verbal errors in this citation from memory, but they can only be very minor. Gandhi's point is plain. He does not make an ideological rally against 'imperialism', but he states the simple, basic, heart-felt truth of the matter. He even uses a word which is significant—'town-dwellers', meaning the same thing as the 'bourgeoisie' (residents of 'burgs', 'bourgs')—a word which, because of its peculiar use, may well have been distasteful to him.

In April 1928 he wrote to Jawaharlal Nehru who had then begun to have doubts about a democracy which does not merge into socialism: 'I entirely agree with you that one day we shall have to have a movement without the rich and the vocal educated class, but that time is not yet'.

For Gandhi, of course, 'that time' never came, and impatient socialists have naturally reviled at it. But the main point is that Gandhi knew, in his own way, that a movement of the people ('demon') had to be cranked in the direction of socialism and the necessary coordination was always, again in his own way, his objective.

Perhaps it will not be wrong to say that with his stress on the right 'means' to achieve truly desired 'ends', Gandhi always fought shy of whatever threatened to make the price of social change too heavy and harmful to man's finer instincts. The cost of revolution has, throughout history, been something of a deterrent to many minds and for the basic transformation of society. Gandhi's chosen heir, Jawaharlal Nehru, wrote in his autobiography, quoting R.H. Tawney, of the claim war that might develop and the stern steps that might be indispensable for such-

ing the present possessor of power—onions, he said, could be peeled leaf by leaf, but a live tiger could not be skinned that way, since it would try to do the skinning first. Perhaps Mr Mahadevan remembers Bernard Shaw saying in 1931, after he had met Gandhi, that Gandhi was 'Mahatma Major' while Shaw was 'Mahatma Minor'. He might also recall a Fabian lecture which Shaw concluded thus: 'I am impatient for the revolution. I shall be jolly happy if the revolution happens to-morrow. But being an average coward I want you to make the revolution in as gentlemanly a manner as possible.' Gandhi and Jawaharlal would not perhaps say 'No' to the aversment.

One may or may not believe that socialism is the fulfilment of democracy, but there seems little reason to think of the two as Scylla and Charybdis which had both better be avoided. One may or may not believe that the spirit underlying both democracy and socialism is profoundly similar if not actually identical—the former more fundamentally relevant to 'means' and the latter to 'ends'. But it is difficult to appreciate the power so aptly formulated by Mr Mahadevan.

Let not Gandhi's dream of the non-acquisitive society to be achieved by right means be equated with opportunism which, one fears, is what Mr Mahadevan euphemistically calls 'resilience responding to reality'.

Gandhi stood on firm ground, where democracy and socialism converged, coalesced and created a new life for humanity.

### *E.M.S. Namboodripad*

The discussion of the question posed before us requires at the very outset a definition of the terms 'democracy' and 'socialism'. I am of the view that if the terms are correctly defined, there is no contradiction between them. On the other hand, if the definition is wrong, there will be found to be obvious contradictions.

The founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, in their classical document, 'The Communist Manifesto', said: 'All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.'

This sums up the correct understanding of 'democracy', and 'socialism' according to scientific socialism. It shows that the two concepts are not only not contradictory but are integrally connected with each other. Wrestling from the hands of the owning classes economic as well as political power which they have been wielding for centuries and ex-



gaining the collective use of that power by society—such is the essence of social change as envisaged by the authors of the Communist Manifesto.

As opposed to this, the ideologues of the bourgeoisie define 'democracy' as a system in which there is the formality of a periodical election by the entire adult population, supplemented by such other formalities as the technical-constitutional responsibility of the executive to the legislature, the liability of the members of the executive and the legislature being challenged by the judiciary, and so on, leading to a series of mutual checks and balances.

It is the contrast of these formalities that, according to them, makes India, U.S.A., U.K. and so on 'democracies', while their absence makes U.S.S.R., China and other socialist countries 'totalitarian'.

As for socialism, the bourgeois ideologues would have us believe, it is a system under which there is a greater amount of equality in the distribution of wealth, even while the ownership of the instruments and means of production is left as it is in the hands of a narrow circle of owning classes.

It is necessary in this connection, to note that ever since the dawn of history, human society has been divided into a toiling majority and an owning minority. The 'good old days' when human society was organized on the basis of complete equality and man did not exploit man, came to an end because the productive capacity of mankind had risen to such an extent that hard work by the toiling majority could keep the owning minority at an ever-increasing level of comfort and luxury. The possibility of such a 'good life' for the minority, vouchsafed for by the hard work of the majority, made it necessary that both political as well as economic power should be wielded by the minority.

This is the essence of the historic break through which the two 'great institutions'—private property and the coercive power of the state—came into existence.

The two institutions of private property and the state have undergone successive changes: naked autocracy, benevolent dictatorship, militarism, local village republics over which is superimposed the system of a feudal-banocratic state, and so on—all these in the political field. In the field of economic ownership, chattel slavery, caste oppression, serfdom and so on.

Passing through these multifarious forms of economic and political domination, the owning classes developed that most sophisticated system of state and private property in the modern bourgeois age, namely, formal parliamentary democracy combined with an economy under which there is 'complete equality' between the employer and the employee. The crudest and crudest inhumanity inherent in earlier systems of domination by the owning minority are done away with in favour of the formal con-

image of 'freedom, equality and fraternity'!

Behind this cover, however, is the reality of bourgeois domination over the common people who are subjected to innumerable forms of oppression and exploitation—under the fine garb of 'equality and fraternity'. The owning classes' domination over the state machinery is sought to be covered up by the attributes of formal democracy—a system in which, said Lenin, 'the common people are perfectly entitled to choose every five years who among their exploiters shall rule over them for the next five years'.

The ending of this system, both in its economic as well as political aspects, is the aim of all genuine socialists, as was clearly explained by the authors of the Communist Manifesto in the above-quoted passage.

The difficulties that we are now facing in our country are, in fact, a further confirmation of the fact that, behind the cover of the two claims of 'democracy' and 'socialism', our own ruling classes are further tightening the noose around the common people. The only solution for these difficulties, therefore, is to see that power—both economic and political—is wrested from the hands of these owning classes and turned over to the common people.

### *Shriam Norayan*

At the outset, let me make it very clear that I do not regard democracy and socialism as incompatible. In fact, I am of the definite view that democracy in order to be real must ensure social justice, and true socialism must necessarily be based on democracy. A democracy which is controlled, more or less, by a dozen or more business houses is, in reality, only a plutocracy. Similarly, socialism as preached in the Soviet Union and the East European countries is communism, pure and simple. It should not be confused with the socialism which India has been trying to establish over the years through the Five Year Plans.

The Parliament of India, in December 1954, adopted the 'socialist pattern of society' as the objective of its social and economic policy. The 'Preamble', the 'Fundamental Rights' and the 'Directive Principles' of the Constitution of India also indicate the basic framework of Indian socialism which is essentially a golden mean between laissez-faire and totalitarianism. In this sense, the socialist pattern in India is neither free private enterprise nor communism. The Second Five Year Plan had made it abundantly clear that the 'socialist pattern' was not 'a rigid dogma', and that 'each country has to develop according to its own genius and traditions'. The Third Plan also stated in unambiguous terms that 'with the rapid expansion of the economy, wider opportunities of growth arise for both the public and private sector, and in many ways their activities are complementary'. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has

observed on several occasions that socialism in India must not be a 'carbon copy' of other countries; we must chalk out our own path in accordance with our cultural heritage and requirements. In truth, lasting welfare and prosperity of the people could be realized only on the basis of the widest participation of the masses in the process of planned economic development.

It is true that in recent years several actions of the Union Government in nationalizing commercial banks, general insurance and coal mines and taking over the wholesale trade in foodgrains have created in the country an atmosphere of suspicion and uncertainty, and private investment has become rather paralytic. Since ours is a mixed economy, it is not the principle of nationalizing some key industries which is in dispute, it is really the manner and method of doing this which raise the dust of opposition and controversy. The Prime Minister as well as the Union Finance Minister have recently declared in categorical words that the Government has no intention of nationalizing more industries only for the sake of nationalization, and that any further action will be taken only after the fullest consideration of all the aspects.

In this context, I should like to suggest that the Union Government should soon publish for the information of the general public certain specific criteria and guidelines for nationalization of industries in the future. This would inspire trust among industrialists and businessmen and create an atmosphere of stability and confidence.

At any rate, I have no manner of doubt that the existing industrial policy of the Government of India is a sound one and should be pursued further with faith and vigour. While the objectives of justice and equality should be achieved without much delay, the equally important aims of liberty and fraternity must not be hyped and suppressed. Indian socialism has to safeguard both the dignity of the individual as well as the unity and well-being of society. With this end in view, both the public as well as the private sector should be treated as integral parts of the National Sector. There should be healthy emulation between the two and the present 'cold war' between them should yield place to a climate of constructive cooperation.

Mahatma Gandhi had placed before the country his concept of 'trusteeship' which should permeate private business and industrial activity. In my opinion, this idea is not utopian philosophy but practical wisdom. It is high time that this Gandhian principle is translated into action in a practical manner. In place of the current atmosphere of class war and mutual recrimination, the trusteeship model would be able to generate a feeling of goodwill and fruitful cooperation between the Government and the entrepreneurs. Gandhi had repeatedly told us that socialism was as pure as crystal and required 'crystal-like means to achieve it'. Violence and even legislative coercion would not lead to the

right type of socialism which seeks to prevent the exploitation of the people by the vested interests.

It is the duty of India, therefore, to show a new way to other developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and prove beyond an iota of doubt that socialism under democracy is a practicable ideal and could be sustained without bloodshed and bad blood, through a process of persuasion, discussion and public education. This is a task which requires the concerted efforts of all of us for its fulfilment and brooks no delay.

In sum, there is no question of 'riding two horses' in pursuing the objective of a socialist democracy. On the contrary, if we now try to change horses in midstream, we shall be doing a great disservice to India which happens to be the very first country in the world to launch the bold experiment of comprehensive economic planning under a democratic set-up. There have been, surely, a number of shortcomings and even failures in this national adventure. But I have little doubt that India is on the right path, and we must not falter and stumble at this stage.

*V.R. Narai*

I disagree with the central proposition that 'democracy and socialism are incompatible—however much we may juggle with catch-phrases like "democratic socialism" and "socialist democracy". They cannot co-exist without the one eroding into the other. They cannot be blended into one concoction except in a highly diluted form'. They can co-exist, they can be blended without the one diluting the other.

But this will be possible only when there is firm faith in, and utter dedication to, both democracy and socialism. Unfortunately, our Hindu ethos is inimical to both the ideals. A believer in the false theories of karma and rebirth which justify the 'gradations and degradations' of the caste system cannot be either a democrat or a socialist. And it is the Hindu ethos that is still dominating our social and political life.

At no stage during the past twenty-five years of our independence were we truly sincere about democracy or socialism. Is it any wonder, then, that what we now have is an apology for democracy and a perversion of socialism?

I believe that what Gandhi cherished most were truth and sincerity. Our greatest betrayal of Gandhi is, according to me, in being neither truthful nor sincere in almost everything we say and do.

*N.G. Ranga*

The Indian masses, in their agony over the failure of our democracy, which (as Mr Mahadevan puts it) 'had stolen the show' during the

past 25 years, have given their reply in unambiguous terms and expressed ecstasy over Mrs Indira Gandhi's bold answer of 'Garibi Hato' ('End Poverty') to the present question, "Which way then shall we go?"

It is wrong to assume that there is an irreconcilable contradiction (or dichotomy) between democracy and socialism. Is there no democracy in Sweden's socialist society? Is not Great Britain growing into a full-fledged socialist society through her mature democracy? Indeed, is not the American so-called free-enterprise, tycoon-led democracy moving towards socialism despite her resistent protestations? What about Italy, France, even West Germany? Are they merely content with democracy?

True, Soviet Russia and Peoples' China have rushed into the soul-killing embraces of dictatorship, albeit of the so-called proletarian kind, in their impatient march towards socialism. Does it mean that it is impossible for them to try to recover democratic freedom, human rights and allow room for individual initiative, incentive and privacy and poetic flights into the space-world of unfettered thoughts and imaginative meanings? The appearance of writers like Pasternak and Solzhenitsyn indicates that even communist dictatorship cannot be so airtight and that the urge for democracy is eternal and cannot be smothered. In fact, Khrushchev's historic thesis at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party is a confession made to the conscience of the communist world that communist dictatorship has found it essential to welcome democracy.

Stalin came to be repugned so violently by that Congress and by his wretched and fattered disciple just because he did not welcome and strengthen Tito's Yugoslavian efforts to soften and enable communist control through democratic freedoms and humane institutions. In the same way, we of the Grand Alliance, who were horrified at the prospect of an ever-tightening tango of controls over the unfettered practice of democratic fundamental rights and constitutional safeguards, were repugned by more than two-thirds of the newly elected M.P.s, who swore their allegiance to Mrs Gandhi. Russians are being targeted, even though in an unhistoric manner, by Mao's Chinese for yielding to democracy. Are those of us among the democrats Gandhians to be similarly targeted, in disregard of the teachings of history, for our acceptance of the March 1971 revolution towards socialism? I say 'No'.

While the communist-minded masses and intellectuals of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and even of Poland have been heralding their passion for democracy, within their overall socialist set up, why should we not welcome the democratic choice being made by our long-suffering, ill-fed, ill clothed and suppressed masses?

It is ungrateful to assume that Gandhi would care at the choice made by our masses in the 1971 and 1972 democratic elections for the

Lok Sabha and the State assemblies respectively—because he was a democrat *par excellence*.

It is possible for Gandhians to go on quoting Gandhi's sayings against one another, but none can quote anything from Gandhi against the greatest priority he gave to the feeding, clothing, housing, educating and humanising of India's *dandamayana*. Mrs Gandhi is now engaged in persuading our democracy and its almost unmanageable administration to suspend, condition or soften—on the lines of Portal's plan—some of the powers, privileges and freedoms so long enjoyed by the few, in order to help the masses in their long deferred efforts to raise their human values and march in lead with at least the last of the stragglers of the privileged people. I am convinced Gandhi would have most willingly wished her success in this. It is because of that conviction that so many of us who have been championing the self-employed masses of peasants and artisans and who had vainly hoped that the privileged changes in our democracy would help our submerged masses to be freed from their sub-human living and undemocratic disabilities, have decided boldly and sincerely to help Mrs Gandhi to fit socialism into Indian democracy. Gandhians ought to help our democracy to uplift its vision and revolutionise its institutions and humanise the political approaches of its leaders and thus metamorphose itself into a socialist democracy, which can meet the worldwide and irresistible challenge—one that brooks no delay—of the *dandamayana*.

If this means the acceptance of some controls, let them be democratically controlled. If it means the disciplining of many people to achieve greater results and higher production, let it be a gandhian type of discipline. If it demands sacrifices from the 'haves' to lessen the rigours of the 'have nots' or the shedding of some millennium-old social privileges and religious prejudices, let them be brought about in the same satyagrahic manner in which untouchability and the priority orders were dropped by our democracy.

### A.B. Shah

Mr Mahadevan's thesis formulates the dilemma before India as that of choosing between two ideological systems—namely, democracy and socialism—and offers Gandhi's 'trans-ideological alternative' as an escape from the horns of the dilemma. I disagree with Mr Mahadevan on both these points.

Mr Mahadevan assumes that democracy and socialism are mutually incompatible, 'however much we may juggle with catch-phrases like "democratic socialism" and "socialist democracy"'. According to him, they cannot coexist 'without the one sliding into the other'.

Is this really true? The answer, I guess, will depend on what one means by democracy and by socialism. Mr Mahadevan does not define either of the two terms, he proceeds on the assumption that each term conveys the same meaning to everyone. I do not know how far this assumption would be justified. If empirical evidence were to provide any indication, one would think that both 'democracy' and 'socialism' mean different things to different persons. For instance, to most people democracy means the rule of the majority, to some, it means 'government of the people, by the people, for the people'.

To me, 'democracy' means essentially two things. It means, first, a system of values centring upon the freedom and dignity of the individual, with all that this phrase would imply, with certain obvious limitations implied in it, in personal and interpersonal life. Thus, for me freedom of expression and of access to information, freedom of association, and the freedom to pursue happiness in one's own way so long as one does not encroach on the similar freedom of others are all implied in my conception of the freedom and dignity of the individual. Political, social and economic equality also is implied in this conception, since in the presence of gross inequalities in any of these spheres, the freedom of the weak is bound to be eroded by the power of those who are 'more equal than others'.

The other thing that 'democracy' means to me is the method of dialogue and of arriving at tentative working decisions on issues that have a bearing on interpersonal relations. The method of dialogue is obviously preferable to that of brute force since otherwise those who are lacking in the relevant kind of power would be at a disadvantage. Also, the method of dialogue in turn implies a rational, as against a traditional and authoritarian, approach to problems in the light of all available, relevant evidence.

The conception of majority rule expresses the need for taking working decisions in a situation in which unanimity is not possible. However, since no one in a given situation can claim to be in possession of all the relevant facts and to be completely free from bias of any kind, and since further the human situation itself is constantly changing, it is understood that such decisions will be subject to revision in the light of experience. This would be true even of unanimous decisions.

Secondly, since social action derives its justification from the values to which it promotes the freedom and dignity of the individual, no majority decision is valid from the standpoint of democracy if it is calculated to negate the values of democracy mentioned above. In other words, even a 100 per cent majority does not have the moral right to destroy democracy.

Socialism originally meant a concern for the weaker sections of society. Since the poor constituted these sections and since the owner-

ship and control of the means of production enabled the rich minority to exploit the weaker sections, socialism soon acquired a primarily economic connotation. Secondly, in course of time the humanist inspiration of the socialist movement receded to the background, and socialism increasingly came to be identified with public ownership of the means of production. Since no civilized human society can be conceived without a state, public ownership in effect meant ownership by the government or its subordinate organs.

I believe that this confusion of the economic program of classical socialism with the values which inspired socialism was the greatest defect that the socialist movement suffered at its very inception. The confusion was strengthened and rationalized by economic analysis of a simplistic kind because the urge for power inherent in the human mind soon got mixed up with the original humanist inspiration which moved the pioneers. However, this was not an accident, though this is not the place to go into it.

To me, socialism means the extension, to the economic sphere, of the value of equality implicit in the classical conception of democracy. I therefore see no insuperable contradiction between democracy and socialism, but only a problem of devising a system that would ensure an optimum realisation of the values of democracy. Since such a system, no matter how carefully designed, has to be worked by human beings, who are essentially 'imperfect', it is clear that democratic socialism can have no sacred policy dogmas, it can only mean an ongoing human experiment which proceeds by trial and error. The complexities of the modern age add to the difficulties and sophistication of the experiment. They should make even the most learned and honest of us humble in our approach.

Since I do not regard democratic socialism as a contradiction in terms, the problem of finding an alternative in terms of 'Gandhi's truth' does not arise for me. I do not understand what this truth can mean in discursive terms, nor can I see how it provides a trans-ideological alternative except in the trivial sense that ideologically it represents neither democracy nor socialism. As far as I have been able to understand Gandhi, he was a great humanist and therefore a great individualist. But his conceptions of truth and freedom were vitiated by a confusion between discursive truth as understood in the natural and social sciences, and intuitive non-discursive 'truth' as perceived by great artists, visionaries and moral reformers. Once again, this is not the place to go into details, and one must tent content with making a bald statement even at the risk of being misunderstood.

As I see it, the problem confronting India is not one of choosing between democracy and socialism, still less between either of them, on the one hand, and the 'trans-ideological alternative' of Gandhi, on the



other. It is, rather, that of instilling in the citizen a strong sense of his rights and obligations, and of building up autonomous centers of enlightened opinion and moral authority in different spheres of public life. For, unless the ordinary citizen is willing to do his duty and to fight for his rights in an organized and democratic manner, neither Mill nor Marx nor Gandhi can help him. This is essentially an educational and cultural task, which has so far been equally neglected by colonialist liberals, socialists and Gandhians. There are a variety of reasons for this neglect, but three of the most important are their attachment to outdated ideas, unwillingness to swim against the populist current and the lure of power and the privileges it brings in an undeveloped society.

### *Ka Naa Subramanyam*

Democracy and socialism as commonly understood, though not well defined, are opposing ideologies. Democracy, faith in individual's need to be different, unique, free and non-conforming. Socialism is the need of the industrial man, not to buy the most he can whether he needs it or not, having the most number of things whether they bring satisfaction or not. Both these present-day needs need the education of the common man, in which in the twenty-five years of our independence we have been sadly lacking. The average Indian is not educated to either democracy or socialism. He cannot use his individual freedom to dissent and non-conform, he does not want the many material things that are thrust on him in the name of progress.

Democracy for the Indian rulers is a sort of shifting ground: for the Congress, without Gandhi, it was fraught with the danger that another party might oust it from power. Interested in entrenching itself as power permanently, the Congress finds it easier to swear by socialism. Marx might have been a prophet of sorts but his prophecy stopped quite short of realities, both the extreme examples of socialist wars in recent history—Russia and China—were, at the time of achieving whatever socialism it was they achieved, ill-developed industrially and the party in power at the moment has entrenched itself in power, in the process promising all kinds of material things and prosperity to the people.

History demonstrates indisputably that ideologies are not what matter but institutions, inheritance and education. Mahatma Gandhi rightly or wrongly comprehended the inheritance of India as truth, a moral attitude to life and living. If India had cultivated the moral attitude to life, in spite of realizing that moral values also change and justice is an abstraction without some kind of sense of moral values—what the Hindu was inclined to call *dharma*—it might have been easier in the long run.

Instead of which both Jawaharlal Nehru and, later, Mrs Indira

Gandhi preferred to stress ideologies to which a nation could be bent from on top. The result has been a lack of faith in plain living and high thinking which Mahatma Gandhi insisted was India's destiny. We have been reduced rather to plain living and plain thinking in these twenty-five years. It has not made for the happiness of the people and it has not made for the material prosperity of the people either, though the ruling ideologies do not recognize that fact as yet.

I am richer than my grandfather—just because I pay ten times more for the essentials of life. But I am not happier than my grandfather, though I am generally considered to be as ill-informed as he was. I tolerate more corruption, more hypocrisy, more injustice, all in the name of a socialism which is said to be round the next corner.

If Gandhi was a reluctant socialist and a half-hearted democrat it was not because he was trans-ideological but because man's life does not begin or end with ideologies, which have to be superimposed from on top. It was because of his instinctual realization that life was moral in all its aspects. It is this sense of morals that we seem to have missed in the twenty-five years of our independence.

There is unfortunately a feeling that the moral life is dependent on the religious life. It is the other way about—religion is dependent on morals. It is on the recovery of morals in life that the future of India will depend; not on slogans of democracy or socialism. But morals are far from the contemplation of the rulers that are. It is in his insistence on morals as the basis of life that Gandhi remains a leader to look up to, and it is here that others have woefully failed us.

### *Ramesh Thapar*

Mr Mahadevan's thesis certainly captures the texture of the debate on our present political and economic crisis. But, as almost always, the texture is imitative, mechanistic, unrelated to the realities of India.

Democracy, socialism, secularism, are phrases which change their taste and smell as they move across frontiers, but the Indian migration becomes extraordinary because here these concepts have to be nurtured in a genuine multi-cultural, continental federal polity. Indeed the concepts are sought in order to cement the political, economic and social structure that is India. This is the forgotten factor in most theoretical analyses about India, and its absence creates an artificial confrontation between a mythical democracy and a mythical socialism.

We are democratic. We are socialist. We are secular. Imperfect, yes. Double-talking, certainly. But under heavy pressure to work out some sort of democratic, socialist, secular structure or else the whole fabric of federal India would collapse. This needs fuller understanding, or else we will be in danger of succumbing to the rather rigid political

formulas of very much more developed and less complicated western nations.

Let me spell it out. Our socialism, a mixture of private and public enterprise, has failed because the productive disciplines of a controlled socialist system have not been brought to bear on our society. Indeed the popular expression of democracy, romanticized by an anti-colonial undercurrent, has wrecked the national discipline which should underpin a socialist-type economic effort.

Our 'man' of democracy and socialism is of a land that has not been witnessed anywhere else. We attempt the democratic practices of the most advanced and affluent and inject into these a socialist theory which has long been abandoned by radical thinkers. In other words, we are living in the intellectual climate of the 'Yerties, the time when our leadership evolved its framework of ideology.

The general failure to apply catalytic concepts to the realities of India, and the uncertainty to the fortifying thought of the last two decades following World War II, have brought us to the prospect of a man-made disaster. The Indian appears to the world as a thoroughly incapable, selfish and short-sighted creature, unable to work for the transformation of the mass of his people.

Now that we have almost arrived at a zero rate of growth, we are compelled to think afresh. This thinking has begun, and naturally there is a going back to the vision of Gandhi. He was the lone voice promoting a genuine alternative rooted in the complex reality of India—the 'trans-ideological alternative', as Mr Mahadevan says. He believed that his alternative could make an impact on the poverty of the mass of the people.

The gandhian alternative, in its essentials, precedes the cultural revolution initiated by Mao Tse-tung. If the alternative had been adopted twenty-five years ago, and had seen a careful moulding in the fire of arduous practice by a party devoted to the tasks inherent in the quest for human liberation, we would probably have thrust forward a democracy towards a free, egalitarian society.

This was not to be. And now the return to the gandhian alternative demands the destruction of the powerful interests which have grown up over the past twenty-five years on the perpetuation of a corrupt and unequal system. The task of correction is forbidding, even demoralizing.

Clearly, the dilemma is man-made. Yet, it is possible to fuse responsible freedom with meaningful egalitarianism. But we will have to re-define our terms of reference. At the core of it all is what we understand by a civilized standard of living, and the value system which must underpin it. This has to be tackled. And it means that we will have to practise what we preach.

## WHO'S WHO

Buddhadewa Bhattacharyya, Department of Political Science, Calcutta University

Trilok Chaudhary, Revolutionary Socialist Party.

Amritasanda Das, Gandhian Institute of Studies, Banaras.

D.N. Dasgupta, *Hindustan Standard*, Calcutta

V.V. Jahn, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla.

J.B. Kripalani, close associate of Mahatma Gandhi

R.C. Majumdar, General Editor, *The History and Culture of the Indian People*.

K.R. Malkani, Editor, *Motherland*, New Delhi

S.N. Misra, Organisation Congress Party

Priya Mody, Swastika Party

Hiran Mukerjee, Communist Party.

E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Communist Party (Marxist).

Shrikanth Narayan, former Governor of Gujarat

V.R. Naidu, Editor, *Andhra Jyoti*, Hyderabad.

N.G. Ranga, Indian National Congress

A.B. Shah, Managing Editor, *Qaumi*, Bombay

Ka Naab Sahasramangam, novelist and critic

Ramesh Thapar, Editor, *Samachar*, New Delhi

# *The Equilibrium State*

DENNIS L. MEADOWS

WE ARE BY NO MEANS THE FIRST PEOPLE in man's written history to propose some sort of non-growing state for human society. A number of philosophers, economists and biologists have discussed such a state and called it by many different names, with as many different meanings.

We have, after much discussion, decided to call the state of constant population and capital by the term 'equilibrium'. Equilibrium means a state of balance or equality between opposing forces. The opposing forces are those causing population and capital stock to increase (high desired family size, low birth-control effectiveness, high rate of capital investment) and those causing population and capital stock to decrease (lack of food, pollution, high rate of depreciation or obsolescence). The word 'capital' should be understood to mean services, industrial and agricultural capital combined. Thus the most basic definition of the state of global equilibrium is that population and capital are externally stable, with the forces tending to increase or decrease them in a carefully controlled balance.

There is much room for variation within that definition. We have only specified that the stocks of capital and population remain constant, but they might theoretically be constant at a high level or a low level—or one might be high and the other low. A tank of water can be maintained at a given level with a fast inflow and outflow of water or with a slow trickle in and out. If the flow is fast, the average drop of water will spend less time in the tank than if the flow is slow. Similarly, a stable population of any size can be achieved with either high, equal birth and death rates (short average lifetime) or low, equal birth and death rates (long average lifetime). A stock of capital can be maintained with high investment and depreciation rates or low investment and depreciation rates. Any combination of these possibilities would fit into our basic definition of global equilibrium.

What criteria can be used to choose among the many options available in the equilibrium state? The first decision that must be made concerns time. How long should the equilibrium state exist? If society is only interested in a time span of six months or a year, almost any level of population and capital could be maintained. If the time horizon is extended to 20 or 30 years, the options are greatly reduced, since the rates and levels must be adjusted to ensure that the capital investment rate will not be limited by resource availability during that time span, or that the death rate will not be uncontrollably influenced by pollution or food shortages. The longer a society prefers to maintain the state of equilibrium, the lower the rates and levels must be.

At the limit, of course, no population or capital level can be maintained forever, but that limit is very far away in time if resources are managed wisely and if there is a sufficiently long time horizon in planning. Let us take as a reasonable time horizon the expected lifetime of a child born into the world tomorrow—72 years if proper food and medical care are supplied. Since most people spend a large part of their time and energy raising children, they might choose as a maximum goal that the society left to those children can be maintained for the full span of the children's lives.

If society's time horizon is as long as 72 years, the permissible population and capital levels may not be too different from those existing today. The rates would be considerably different from those of today, however. Any society would undoubtedly prefer that the death rate be low rather than high, since a long, healthy life seems to be a universal human desire. To maintain equilibrium with long life expectancy, the birth rate then must also be low. It would be best, too, if the capital investment and depreciation rates were low, because the lower they are, the less resource depletion and pollution there will be. Keeping depletion and pollution to a minimum could either increase the maximum size of the population and capital levels or increase the length of time the equilibrium state could be maintained, depending on which goal the society as a whole preferred.

By choosing a fairly long time horizon for its existence, and a long average lifetime as a desirable goal, we have now arrived at a maximum set of requirements for the state of global equilibrium. They are:

1. The capital plant and the population are constant in size. The birth rate equals the death rate and the capital investment rate equals the depreciation rate.
2. All input and output rates—births, deaths, investment, and depreciation—are kept to a minimum.
3. The level of capital and population and the ratio of the two are set in accordance with the values of the economy. They may be deliberately revised and slowly adjusted as the advances of technology

creates new options.

An equilibrium defined in this way does not mean stagnation. Within the first two guidelines above, corporations could expand or fail, local populations could increase or decrease, income could become more or less evenly distributed. Technological advance would permit the services provided by a constant stock of capital to increase slowly. Within the third guideline, any country could change its average standard of living by altering the balance between its population and its capital. Furthermore, a society could adjust to changing internal or external factors by raising or lowering the population or capital stocks, or both, slowly and in a controlled fashion, with a predetermined goal in mind. The three points above define a dynamic equilibrium, which need not and probably would not "freeze" the world into the population-capital configuration that happens to exist at the present time. The object in accepting the above three statements is to create freedom for society, not to impose a straitjacket.

What would life be like in such an equilibrium state? Would innovation be stifled? Would society be locked into the patterns of inequality and injustice we see in the world today? Discussion of these questions must proceed on the basis of mental models, for there is no formal model of social conditions in the equilibrium state. No one can predict what sort of institutions mankind might develop under these new conditions. There is, of course, no guarantee that the new society would be much better or even much different from that which exists today. It seems possible, however, that a society released from struggling with the many problems caused by growth may have more energy and ingenuity available for solving other problems. In fact, we believe, as we shall illustrate below, that the evolution of a society that favours innovation and technological development, a society based on equality and justice, is far more likely to evolve in a state of global equilibrium than in the state of growth we are experiencing today.

### *Growth in the Equilibrium State*

In 1857 John Stuart Mill wrote: "It is scarcely necessary to remark that a stationary condition of capital and population implies no stationary state of human improvement. There would be as much scope as ever for all kinds of mental culture, and moral and social progress, as much room for improving the Art of Living and much more likelihood of its being improved."<sup>1</sup>

Population and capital are the only quantities that need to be constant in the equilibrium state. Any human activity that does not require a large flow of irreplaceable resources or produce severe environmental degradation might continue to grow indefinitely. In particular, those pursuits that many people would list as the most desirable and satisfying

activities of man—education, art, music, religion, basic scientific research, athletics, and social interactions—could flourish.

All of the activities listed above depend very strongly on two factors. First, they depend upon the availability of some surplus production after the basic human needs of food and shelter have been met. Second, they require leisure time. In any equilibrium state the relative levels of capital and population could be adjusted to assure that human material needs are fulfilled at any desired level. Since the amount of material production would be essentially fixed, every improvement in production methods could result in increased leisure for the population—leisure that could be devoted to any activity that is relatively non-consuming and non-polluting, such as those listed above. Thus, the unhappy situation described by Bertrand Russell could be avoided. "Suppose that, at a given moment, a certain number of people are engaged in the manufacture of pins. They make as many pins as the world needs, working (pay) eight hours a day. Someone makes an invention by which the same number of men can make twice as many pins as before. But the world does not need twice as many pins. Pins are already so cheap that hardly any more will be bought at a lower price. In a sensible world, everybody concerned in the manufacture of pins would take to working four hours instead of eight, and everything else would go on as before. But in the actual world this would be thought demoralizing. The men still work eight hours, there are too many pins, some employers go bankrupt, and half the men previously concerned in making pins are thrown out of work. There is, in the end, just as much leisure as on the other plan, but half the men are totally idle while half are still over-worked. In this way it is assured that the unavoidable leisure shall cause misery all around instead of being a universal source of happiness. Can anything more (misery be imagined?"

But would the technological improvements that permit the production of pins or anything else more efficiently be forthcoming in a world where all basic material needs are fulfilled and additional production is not allowed? Does man have to be pushed by hardship and the incentive of material growth to devise better ways to do things?

Historical evidence would indicate that very few key inventions have been made by men who had to spend all their energy overcoming the immediate pressures of survival. Atomic energy was discovered in the laboratories of basic science by individuals unaware of any threat of fossil fuel depletion. The first genetic experiments, which led a hundred years later to high-yield agricultural crops, took place in the peace of a European monastery. Pressing human need may have forced the application of these basic discoveries to practical problems, but only freedom from need produced the knowledge necessary for the practical applications.



Technological advance would be both necessary and welcome in the equilibrium state. A few obvious examples of the kinds of practical discoveries that would enhance the workings of a steady state society include: (a) new methods of waste collection, to decrease pollution and make discarded material available for recycling; (b) more efficient techniques of recycling, to reduce rates of resource depletion; (c) better product design to increase product lifetime and promote easy repair, so that the capital depreciation rate would be minimized; (d) harnessing of incident solar energy, the most pollution-free power source; (e) methods of natural pest control, based on more complete understanding of ecological inter-relationships; (f) medical advances that would decrease the death rate; (g) contraceptive advances that would facilitate the equalization of the birth rate with the decreasing death rate.

As for the incentive that would encourage men to produce such technological advances, what better incentive could there be than the knowledge that a new idea would be translated into a visible improvement in the quality of life? Historically mankind's long record of new inventions has resulted in crowding, deterioration of the environment, and greater social inequality because greater productivity has been absorbed by population and capital growth. There is no reason why higher productivity could not be translated into a higher standard of living or more leisure or more pleasant surroundings for everyone, if these goals replace growth as the primary value of society.

### *Equality in the Equilibrium State*

One of the most commonly accepted myths in our present society is the promise that a continuation of our present patterns of growth will lead to greater equality. It has been demonstrated, however, that present patterns of population and capital growth are actually increasing the gap between the rich and the poor on a world-wide basis, and that the ultimate result of a continued attempt to grow according to the present pattern will be a disastrous collapse.

The greatest possible impediment to more equal distribution of the world's resources is population growth. It seems to be a universal observation, regrettable but understandable, that as the number of people over whom a fixed resource must be distributed increases, the equality of distribution decreases. Equal sharing becomes social suicide if the average amount available per person is not enough to maintain life. FAO studies of food distribution have actually documented this general observation. Analysis of distribution curves shows that when the food supplies of a group diminish, inequalities in intake are accentuated, while the number of undernourished families increases more than in proportion to the deviation from the mean. Moreover, the food intake deficit grows with the size of households so that large families, and their

children in particular, are statistically the most likely to be underfed.<sup>2</sup>

In a long-term equilibrium state, the relative levels of population and capital, and their relationships to fixed constraints such as land, fresh water, and mineral resources, would have to be set so that there would be enough food and material production to maintain everyone at (at least) a subsistence level. One barrier to equal distribution would thus be removed. Furthermore, the other effective barrier to equality—the promise of growth—could no longer be maintained, as Dr Herman E. Daly has pointed out. “For several reasons the important issue of the stationary state will be distribution, not production. The problem of relative shares can no longer be avoided by appeals to growth. The argument that everyone should be happy as long as he obtains share of wealth increases, regardless of his relative share, will no longer be available . . . The stationary state would make fewer demands on our environmental resources, but much greater demands on our moral resources.”<sup>3</sup>

There is, of course, no assurance that humanity's moral resources would be sufficient to solve the problems of income distribution, even in an equilibrium state. However, there is even less assurance that such social problems will be solved in the present state of growth, which is straining both the moral and the physical resources of the world's people.

The picture of the equilibrium state we have drawn here is idealized, to be sure. It may be impossible to achieve in the form described here, and it may not be the form most people on earth would choose. The only purpose in describing it at all is to emphasize that global equilibrium need not mean an end to progress or human development. The possibilities within an equilibrium state are almost endless.

An equilibrium state would not be free of pressures, since no society can be free of pressures. Equilibrium would require trading certain human freedoms, such as producing unlimited numbers of children or consuming uncontrolled amounts of resources, for other freedoms, such as relief from pollution and crowding and the threat of collapse of the world system. It is possible that new freedoms might also arise—universal and unlimited education, leisure for creativity and inventiveness, and, most important of all, the freedom from hunger and poverty enjoyed by such a small fraction of the world's people today.

#### *The transition from growth to global equilibrium*

We can say very little at this point about the practical, day-by-day steps that might be taken to reach a desirable, sustainable state of global equilibrium. Our thoughts have not been developed in sufficient detail to understand all the implications of the transition from growth to equilibrium. Before any part of the world's society embarks delibe-

rarity on such a transition, there must be much more discussion, more extensive analysis, and many new ideas contributed by many different people. If we stimulate each reader to begin pondering how such a transition might be carried out, we shall have accomplished our immediate goal.

Certainly much more information is needed to manage the transition to global equilibrium. The most glaring deficiencies in present knowledge occur in the pollution sector. How long does it take for any given pollutant to travel from its point of release to its point of entrance into the human body? Does the time required for the processing of any pollutant into harmful form depend on the level of pollutant? Do several different pollutants acting together have a synergistic effect on human health? What are the long-term effects of low-level dosages on humans and other organisms? There is also a need for more information about rates of soil erosion and land wastage under unmodified modern agricultural practices.

From our own vantage point as systems analysts, of course, we would recommend that the search for facts not be random but be governed by a steadily increased emphasis on establishing system structure. The behavior of all complicated social systems is primarily determined by the web of physical, biological, psychological, and economic relationships that binds together any human population, its natural environment, and its economic activities. Until the underlying structures of our socio-economic systems are thoroughly analyzed, they cannot be managed effectively, just as an automobile cannot be maintained in good running condition without a knowledge of how its many parts influence each other. Studies of system structure may reveal that the introduction into a system of some simple stabilizing feedback mechanism will solve many difficulties. There have been interesting suggestions along that line already—for example, that the total costs of pollution and resource depletion be included in the price of a product, or that every user of river water be required to place his intake pipe downstream from his effluent pipe.

The final, most elusive, and most important information we need deals with human values. As soon as a society recognizes that it cannot maximize everything for everyone, it must begin to make choices. Should there be more people or more wealth, more wilderness or more automobiles, more food for the poor or more services for the rich? Establishing the correct answers to questions like these and translating those answers into policy is the essence of the political process. Yet few people in any society even realize that such choices are being made every day, much less ask themselves what their own choice would be. The equilibrium society will have to weigh the trade-offs engendered by a finite earth not only with a consideration of present human values but

also with a consideration of future generations. To do that, society will need better means than exist today for clarifying the realistic alternatives available, for establishing social goals, and for achieving the alternatives that are most consistent with those goals. But most important of all, long-term goals must be specified and short-term goals made consistent with them.

Although we underline the need for more study and discussion of these difficult questions, we end on a note of urgency. We hope that intensive study and debate will proceed simultaneously with an ongoing program of action. The details are not yet specified, but the general direction for action is obvious. Enough is known already to analyze many proposed policies in terms of their tendencies to promote or to regulate growth. Numerous nations have adopted or are considering programs to stabilize their populations. Some localized areas are also trying to reduce their rates of economic growth.<sup>4</sup> These efforts are weak at the moment, but they could be strengthened very quickly if the goal of equilibrium were recognized as desirable and important by any sizable part of human society.

We have repeatedly emphasized the importance of the natural delays in the population-capital system of the world. These delays mean, for example, that if Mexico's birth rate gradually declined from its present value to an exact replacement value by the year 2000, the country's population would continue to grow until the year 2060. During that time the population would grow from 50 million to 130 million.<sup>5</sup> If the United States population had two children per family starting now and if there were no new immigration, the population would still continue to grow until the year 2037, and it would increase from 200 million to 266 million.<sup>6</sup> If world population as a whole reached a replacement-size family by the year 2600 (at which time the population would be 5.8 billion), the delays caused by the age structure would result in a final leveling-off of population at 8.2 billion<sup>7</sup> (assuming that the death rate would not rise before then—an unlikely assumption, according to available evidence).

Taking no action to solve these problems is equivalent to taking wrong action. Every day of continued exponential growth brings the world system closer to the ultimate limits to that growth. A decision to do nothing is a decision to increase the risk of collapse. We cannot say with certainty how much longer mankind can postpone instituting deliberate control of his growth before he will have lost the chance for control. We suspect on the basis of present knowledge of the physical constraints of the planet that the growth phase cannot continue for another one hundred years. Again, because of the delays in the system, if the global society waits until these constraints are unmistakably apparent, it will have waited too long.

If there is cause for deep concern, there is also cause for hope. Deliberately limiting growth would be difficult, but not impossible. The way to proceed is clear, and the necessary steps, although they are new ones for human society, are well within human capabilities. Man possesses, for a small moment in his history, the most powerful combination of knowledge, tools and resources the world has ever known. He has all that is physically necessary to create a totally new form of human society—one that would be built to last for generations. The two missing ingredients are a realistic, long-term goal that can guide mankind to the equilibrium society and the human will to achieve that goal. Without such a goal and a commitment to it, short-term concerns will generate the exponential growth that drives the world system toward the limits of the earth and ultimate collapse. With the goal and that commitment, mankind would be ready now to begin a controlled, orderly transition from growth to global equilibrium.

---

© COPYRIGHT DENNIS L. MEADOWS. Excerpted from chapter 3 of *The Limits to Growth* (Bantam-Tavol Limited, London, 1972).

1. John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, in *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, ed. V.W. Bixler and J.M. Robson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. 734.

2. Bertrand Russell, in *Primer of Ideology and Other Essays* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1933), pp. 14-15.

3. UN Food and Agriculture Organization, *Provisional Indicative World Plan for Agricultural Development* 2-439.

4. Herman E. Daly, 'Toward a Stationary-State Economy', in *The Further Earth*, ed. John Marie and Robert Rothenow (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), pp. 204-17.

5. See, for example, 'Pollen Amateurs Keep Out' *Forbes*, June 13, 1971, p. 22, and *The Economist*, January 1972.

6. J. Douglass Piche and S.-Albert Talbot, 'Un Taux d'accroissement nul pour les pays en voie de développement en l'an 2000: Révision réaliste?', *Population* 25 (Septembre/Décembre 1970): 977.

7. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, *An Interim Report to the President and the Congress* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1971).

8. Bernard Barham, *The Population Council Report Annual Report, 1970* (New York: The Population Council, 1970), p. 19.

# *Peace research: the radical critique*

MICHAEL D. WALLACE

SINCE IT WAS FIRST COINED, THE TERM 'peace research' has embraced the intellectual activities of an extremely heterogeneous group of men and women. Peace researchers vary widely in their intellectual training, methodological perspectives and research interests, as well as in their personal values and political beliefs. Traditionally this diversity has proven to be an asset rather than a liability; instead of generating schisms over points of ideological or methodological orthodoxy, it has resulted in a pooling of expertise, ideas and points of view which has markedly advanced our collective understanding of conflict, war and peace. This happy result has been due to the strength of purpose that guided the inquiry. Given the continuing threat of nuclear annihilation in the contemporary era, whatever differences existed were not considered to be as important as the common goal of generating rigorous knowledge which would reduce the dangers of unprecedented destruction and loss of life that might result from large-scale conflict in the international system or its subsystems. Disagreements within the discipline have for this reason remained well within the traditional conception of scholarly discourse, and it was not questioned on any side that the purpose of such controversy was to clarify the intellectual task at hand and assist in its execution.

However, recent debates amongst peace researchers have raised serious doubts about the continued ability of this common purpose to unify the discipline, or whether indeed such agreement exists any longer. Some scholars have begun to raise questions challenging the present orientation of peace research which are couched in the rhetoric of politics and ideology. In doing so, they frequently appeal to the philosophical differences which separate peace-oriented scholars from one another rather than to the goal which supposedly unites them. These criticisms—generally referred to as 'the radical critique of peace research'—have sparked an intense debate within the discipline which has gone a fair way to

needs any feeling of shared goals amongst peace researchers of different nationalities and political persuasions.

Many peace researchers have been quick to assume that this debate represents a integrative development, and that the new criticism, if heeded, would seriously undermine what has been accomplished so far. According to this view, the issue is a simple one, the radical critics, in judging peace research by their own political standards, have betrayed the aims of the discipline. They have abandoned internationalism in favour of a narrowly partisan view of the world's conflicts; abandoned neutrality for ideological fervour, and abandoned intellectual inquiry to engage in political advocacy. If they were to be taken seriously, the result would be the fragmentation of peace research with different factions sniping at one another from behind barricades of ideological *partis pris*. From this perspective, the issues raised by the radical critique are not really matters for scholarly debate at all.

However, it may well be that this appraisal represents more a reaction to the language and tone of the radical critique than an evaluation of the arguments being presented. If these are carefully examined, it becomes clear that it is very misleading to interpret the debate as a confrontation between the traditional 'scholarly' approach seeking to uphold the goals of peace research and a new 'political' one concerned with an entirely new set of priorities. The radical scholars do not seem to be abandoning the old goals so much as challenging the way these have been interpreted and implemented by a large number of their colleagues. From their point of view, it is 'traditional' peace research which constitutes a betrayal.

If this interpretation is accurate then it does our cause no service to dismiss the radical viewpoint out of hand, or to treat the issues involved as essentially irrelevant to scholarly activity. Given the changes that have taken place in both the world situation and our own cognitive maps since the objects and strategies of peace research were originally formulated, we should scarcely be surprised if some degree of re-orientation and re-direction were necessary. And if the underpinnings of our discipline are in fact shaky in some respects, now is the time to make the necessary modifications; the poverty of the present world situation scarcely permits us the luxury of discovering our mistakes in the future if any. In other words, the radical critique may not be an irrelevant distraction but a valuable opportunity to reassess our progress and prospects, and for this reason it seems well worth while to undertake a systematic examination of the main issues in the debate. This paper is a modest beginning in this direction.

Although the new criticism of peace research touch upon a variety of matters, here we will deal only with what seem to be the four central complaints (a) that most peace research is trivial or irrelevant to the real

problems of peace and war, (b) that the discipline has a pro-American bias, (c) that it is oriented towards maintaining the status quo, and (d) that it takes a narrow and one-sided view of violence. What validity do these charges have, and what are their implications for the development of the discipline?

#### KNOWLEDGE VS ACTION

Perhaps the most frequent charge made by the radicals against peace research is that the activities of the discipline are irrelevant to the problems of peace and war. According to this view, we have quite sufficient knowledge to achieve peace already, everything from disarmament plans to economic schemes for re-tooling war industries to international legal codes have been worked out already (Rapoport, 1970). What is needed is action to implement the knowledge we have.

In one sense, this claim misses the point entirely. The task facing peace research is not and has never been merely that of devising the technical arrangements for a smooth transition to a warless world. The problem is, rather, to identify the substantive obstacles to this transition and to determine in what ways they may be removed or neutralized. Thus, it is misleading to liken the present position of peace research to that of a doctor with a vaccine but no staff to administer it (Rapoport, 1970, p. 379). Perhaps a more accurate analogy would be of the medical researcher who has a vaccine that works, but only on monkeys. To be sure, we would have a solution to the problem of war if only nation-states behaved differently than they do in fact. But the researcher would be ridiculed if his 'solution' was to argue that men would react like apes if only we were diligent enough in persuading them to do so.<sup>2</sup> Since homo sapiens is indeed a distinct species and since nation-states show little inclination to change in the right ways of their own volition, we are still left with the problem of getting from where we are to where we really want to be. Obviously we do not have enough knowledge for that, and indeed perhaps one reason for the anguish gripping the discipline at the moment is that many peace researchers are only now beginning to appreciate how difficult the problem really is.

But there is another and much more valid way to formulate the radicals' criticism. It is not that we have enough 'knowledge' and need more 'action' but rather that the urgency and gravity of the present world situation makes it vital that we marshal our intellectual resources with a view to tackling concrete problems. Phrased in this way, it hardly seems an unreasonable demand, after all, the original concept of peace research was that of an applied discipline. But as some have pointed out (Schwartz, 1969), the discipline as a whole has paid too little attention to the difficulties involved in applying the evidence and knowledge we have collected to contemporary problems. Peace re-



searchers have tended to perceive their task as simply a matter of perfecting their scientific understanding of the origins of conflict and violence, tacitly assuming that the practical applications of this body of knowledge will be more or less self-evident.

Unfortunately, there is good reason to believe that this assumption is far too optimistic: in several important ways, the requirements of an applied science differ from those of a 'pure' inquiry, making it difficult or impossible to affix many police research findings 'as is'. This fact does not imply that we need or ought to abandon our scientific task of building or verifying models and hypotheses, and certainly not that social science findings cannot be applied to practical policy problems. On the contrary, our long-run practical success must inevitably depend on the achievements of our scientific inquiries. But to the extent that our work is to have short-run practical importance, it will be necessary to take these different requirements into account both in the selection of research problems and in the interpretations we put upon the knowledge gathered. Let us now turn to an examination of these differing requirements and the changes that might be made in our research strategies to meet them.

#### *Theoretical generalizations and applied science*

To begin with, there are two important ways in which the requirements of applied science are less demanding and rigorous than those of an inquiry oriented solely towards systematic description and exploration. The first point concerns the need to recognize the value of our own work. It is often difficult to realize that concepts, generalizations, and findings which are inadequate or incomplete from the point of view of our theoretical concerns may be entirely sufficient to deal with some practical problem (Kaplan, 1964, p. 404). Many illustrations of this are to be found in the physical sciences. For example, from the point of view of modern physics the gas laws, and the theory of molecular motion upon which they rest, have long since been found wanting. Nevertheless, they were fully adequate to enable engineers to build steam engines, if these men had waited for the development of quantum mechanics, we would still be using coals—*and it would be no easier to build a steam engine!* And, let us not think the analogy of the gas laws pressures too much on the current level of knowledge in the social sciences, it might be pointed out that the great Gothic cathedrals were built some two centuries before their architects distinguished between the geometric centre of an object and its centre of gravity.

Parallel situations may arise in police research more often than we think; we are sometimes so concerned with the underdeveloped state of our knowledge that we may pretend there is nothing we can say. Even the lowliest statistical regularity may help shed light on a particular

problem if an analogous or recurrent case should arise, if, for example, leaders and decision-makers could refer to a list of situations similar to the one they were facing which allowed them to determine the probability of conflict associated with each available move (Singer, 1979), the probability of conflict might well be markedly reduced. There will always be more to know and discover, and our theories and generalisations must be continually rendered obsolete as the discipline progresses, to use this fact as an excuse to defer their application is, in the modern lexicon, a cop-out.

### *The criteria for inference*

A second respect in which the standards of pure inquiry are too rigid for an applied science is in the matter of the weight of evidence required for proof. For scientific purposes, the crucial thing is to avoid Type I error, the cardinal sin is making inferences for which there is insufficient evidence. But when it becomes time to apply what we know, both Type I and Type II errors must be avoided, so return to our medical researcher and his vaccine, he can afford neither to underestimate the probability of dangerous side-effects and expose the population to danger nor overestimate these effects and deprive people of protection against disease.

In the social sciences, this problem of the standards of proof arises primarily in the treatment of statistical regularities. It has become the convention to discount any such observed regularity unless it has less than a 5 per cent probability of occurring by chance alone, if this probability is greater than .05, the evidence for the existence of a relationship is deemed 'not sufficient'. Now even if this procedure is adequate for the purposes of scientific inquiry, it is clear that a more Bayesian perspective is required when we come to apply our findings to practical problems (Kaplan, 1964, pp 236-237). If we want to obtain a conclusion between the implementation of policy X at time  $t$  and the onset of war at time  $t+1$ , it would be both misleading and irresponsible to inform a policy-maker that the evidence connecting X with war was 'insufficient' or 'not significant' merely because the observed regularity had a 10 probability of occurring by chance. It is important that we avoid allowing scientific caution to conceal or discard such important policy information.

### *The applicability of findings*

If there are two senses in which scientific standards are too rigid for practical purposes, there are two equally important respects in which they do not go far enough. To begin with, it is not good enough to have a good explanatory model, hypothesis or theory. To be useful as a source of policy alternatives a model must deal with mutable objects

and explain by means of manipulable variables (Schwartz, 1969). If the explanation is couched in terms of units whose behaviour or state is outside the control of the actors involved, or if it employs variables whose values cannot be altered significantly by those actors, then it is of little practical value.

Perhaps one of the clearest examples of this divergence between the requirements of scientific explanation and practical utility is to be found in my own research. By measuring the divergences between rank-orderings of nations on several dimensions of status in the international system, I was able to account for a good deal of the variance in the amount of international war begun in the system from 1820 to 1964 (Wallace, 1970, 1971). Although 'successful' from the scientific point of view, this work has little value as a guide to policy. By explaining conflict at the level of the international system as a whole, the model imparts little information to policy-makers; it does no good to be told that there is an increasing probability of war somewhere in the world. Furthermore, since it is probably well beyond the ability of any single nation or group of nations to manipulate national status rankings, this explanation of war does not offer any ready means whereby conflict can be controlled. In order to bring these findings into the policy realm it is necessary (i) to specify the causal sequence of intervening variables, one of which may prove amenable to manipulation (Wallace, 1972) and (ii) to develop tests of the status discrepancy hypothesis as a predictor of national behaviour.<sup>1</sup>

In other words, before many policy research studies can be used as sources of systematic knowledge for policy purposes, they will require a good deal of extension and reformation. Otherwise, the policy 'implications' drawn from them are likely to be just that: vague conjectures and speculations whose empirical content is only poorly grounded in evidence.

#### *The need for more information*

A second need in policy-related studies is for specific, contextual information above and beyond the general laws which can be applied to the particular problem. Although, of course, we must deal with problems as far as possible with reference to rigorous generalisations, we should not pretend, in our desire to move beyond traditional policy analysis, that these writings contain nothing of use. On the contrary, this 'soft' evidence can and must be collected and referred to in cases where hard evidence is not available on some aspect of a problem.

At the risk of some redundancy, let me stress that I do not mean to imply by this that there are 'things not amenable to scientific treatment' or that speculation and conventional wisdom are ever substitutes for scientific findings. The point is merely that all of our generalisations

are probabilistic, in any given case, the values predicted by the model will be a bit off, with an 'error' or residual term left over. From the point of view of perfecting our scientific explanation, the best strategy to reduce this prediction error is to include additional variables in the model. For policy purposes, however, it may be impossible to wait for such greater precision to develop, in the interim, it is better to account for the residual term actively than to ignore it. In this way, engineers took account of such factors as wear rates and wind buffeting long before these 'residual' but crucial forces could be rigorously described or their action explained. In similar fashion, it may be necessary to deal actively with such variables as morale, military efficiency, or social cohesion (White, 1973).

To sum up then, it is not a question of either doing 'pure science' or being concerned with practical steps towards peace, workable peace policies require scientific knowledge, but by itself this knowledge is not sufficient. The radical critique thus serves to remind us of something we all acknowledge but tend to forget in the arduous and exciting process of discovery: our efforts are undertaken for a practical purpose and it is well worth the extra thought and effort to ensure that they do in reality contribute to that end.

#### PEACE RESEARCH AND U.S. POLICY

Although the radical critique alleges that peace research is not sufficiently policy-relevant, it also asserts that such practical concern as does manifest itself is strongly biased in a pro-American direction. If one examines the policy-oriented writing in the field, say the critics, it is immediately apparent that almost all of it is written from a viewpoint which, if not always actively sympathetic to U.S. foreign policy, is at least not incompatible with the aims, beliefs, and interests of American policy makers (Denek, 1969, Caspari, 1969). In effect, the argument runs, a very large proportion of American peace researchers have submitted to the blandishments and financial inducements of the large American foundations and the various U.S. defence agencies (Schmid, 1968, p. 122), and have unwittingly become part of the 'systematic effort . . . to mobilize technicians, men of science, and intellectuals generally, in the service of capitalist and neo-colonialist purposes' (Denek, 1969).

Now to the extent that this view represents an assessment of the beliefs and inner goals of the majority of American peace researchers it is clearly false. First, there is no evidence that this group is generally in agreement with the goals and methods of U.S. policy, indeed, many unguarded advertisements in the *New York Times* and much financed political campaigning attest to the opposite. Second it is equally misleading to infer that more than a handful have become 'defence intellectuals'.

The connections between some peace researchers and U.S. officialdom cited to prove this allegation usually demonstrate only the contrasting efforts of these scholars to influence American policy in a more rational direction.

However, the very strength of this commitment to altering U.S. policy leads to a more valid point of criticism implicit in the radicals' charge. This concerns the implicit assumptions often made concerning the probable consumers of peace research knowledge. There is a very widespread tendency amongst American peace researchers to accept without serious reflection the assumption that their primary audience consists of the U.S. foreign policy elite along with its associated sub-official and attentive public. One indication of this assumption is to be found in the large portions of the field oriented almost exclusively toward the problems of superpower conflict, deterrence and strategy theory along with arms control and disarmament studies are the chief examples. Although the past decade has seen a gratifying shift from a 'we-they' cold war outlook to studies which take account of Soviet policy perspectives (Broadbenbaker, 1961; White, 1963), there is still an unfortunate tendency to ignore other national actors or to conceptualize them as 'pawns' (Russett, 1955). Moreover, even those policy-oriented studies which deal with other forms of conflict have tended to focus very largely on the alternatives posed for American policy makers, as for example have the vast majority of studies undertaken of the Second Indochina War.<sup>4</sup>

Of course, the argument can be made that it is as it should be. For one thing, the U.S. clearly wields a paramount influence in world affairs, making changes in American policy crucial to the success of any peace program. Second, the danger posed by the enormous American nuclear arsenal and vast military machine constitutes a powerful argument for beginning the implementation of peace policy in the nation controlling it. Finally, if—as surely most radicals would argue—the U.S. record of conflict behaviour in the postwar period has been worse than that of most other nations, it would seem only good sense to start there. Nevertheless, there are two important respects in which this largely American focus is indeed unfortunate.

#### *Chauvin and bias*

First, while the point has been made often, it is worth recalling that the very process of formulating policy alternatives is likely to lead to political bias when undertaken on behalf of only one country (Singer, 1961). From the viewpoint of a single nation, its own interests, beliefs and values are the 'givens' of the policy process, while those of other nations represent variables to be neutralized or manipulated. Thus, no matter how generally beneficial the outcome of a suggested policy is thought to

be, if it is formulated so as to be acceptable to national policy-makers it must stress the maximization of that nation's welfare, it need be at the expense of others. Only when the examination of policy alternatives is extended to include all participants in a conflict is there a chance of overcoming this bias.

Of course, if the purpose of such inquiries is simply to re-direct policy towards the more complete fulfillment of purely national goals, the existence of such a bias would not necessarily be a matter for concern. But surely the whole raison d'être of peace research is the furtherance of the common goals and interests of nations (Galtung, 1967), the discipline is nothing if it is not international in orientation. It is disconcerting, therefore, that conflicts such as that in Indochina are regarded almost exclusively as American policy problems. It is rarely equally legitimate to turn things around and pose the conflict as a problem for Vietnamese policy: how can the DRV secure the withdrawal of the American military presence in Vietnam with the minimum loss of Vietnamese lives? The point made by the radical critics is that the one approach is no more "political" than the other, and that the adoption of the Vietnamese perspective in the conflict would not only have a salutary effect on our understanding of the problem, but might very well lead to more fruitful suggestions concerning the termination of the conflict than we have been able to produce thus far.

#### *The optimal clientele*

This last possibility leads to the second objection to the American-oriented character of most peace policy studies. It is not only that such a focus may bias our outlook, it is not at all obvious that studies undertaken from this perspective are more likely to further the cause of peace than ones aimed at a different clientele. There are four reasons why this is so.

First, implicit in much current policy research is not only the indisputable assumption that the U.S. is the most influential nation in the international system, but also that by and large it is the most susceptible to influence by the findings and proposals of peace research. While it is certainly true that American administrators and political leaders are more conversant with, and therefore probably more sympathetic to, social science than their counterparts in many other nations, the evidence seems to indicate that major social, political and economic forces in the U.S. stand in the way of the implementation of most peace policy proposals (Waltman, 1970; Rapoport, 1970). At the very least, it is difficult to conceive of new initiatives being possible under the tenure of the present Administration. At the moment, then, the voice of peace research cannot carry further than those sub-class and amiable publics not committed to present policies and hence not immediately in a position to

implement any new proposals.

Second, as American focus grows the many small and jaded powers which stand to benefit a great deal from the findings of peace research. Many of these nations conduct their foreign policies under far less stressful conditions than do the superpowers, and for this reason are more likely to be amenable to peace research influence. At the same time, they often lack the facilities and resources to analyze their external environment in a systematic fashion, and are often forced to make policy decisions with only impressionistic data on some crucial variables. A well-established body of policy-oriented peace research knowledge, provided that it be truly international in character, might receive more welcome than we have tended to assume, after all, a disproportionately large number of peace initiatives have been undertaken by small and middle powers. Given the demonstrated willingness of these nations to make themselves useful in the cause of peace, it seems surprising that so few peace policy studies should have been directed towards discovering means to make their efforts most effective.

Third, in opting for an American-oriented policy focus, many peace researchers have tended to assume that the socialist nations cannot be considered as potential clients. It is important that we emphasize by our choice of research topics what most of us insist upon as a matter of fact: that the socialist nations as a group are inclined to avoid violent conflict, and that their thinking on policy matters is no longer dominated by a monolithic and impenetrable ideological system. If they possessed a more complete knowledge of the alternative policies open to them and the effects these would have on the international environment, resolution of some Cold War conflicts might come more readily. For example, even with existing knowledge of American and West European public opinion there is no doubt a great deal peace researchers can tell socialist policy-makers about which policy moves will be perceived by Western mass publics as friendly and conciliatory, and which as threatening or hostile.

The increasing decentralization of the international system suggests a fourth and final reason for de-emphasizing U.S.-oriented peace research. During the period when the Cold War was at its peak, not only was the Soviet-American conflict the most intense and dangerous, but virtually every other major conflict either was, or quickly became, linked to the superpower conflict system. But with the gradual erosion of superpower spheres of influence has come a decentralization of conflict patterns. Not only are fewer conflicts tied to the superpower axis, but the Big Two have to some extent lost their former ability to dictate bloc policy without consulting their allies. Under these circumstances peace research aimed largely at influencing superpower conflict patterns is no longer sufficient. To control conflict, it is now necessary to focus on

well as those other bloc members which may be capable of exerting some degree of influence on bloc policy, and to orient still other research toward the growing number of potential 'customers' whose problems and interests lie outside the Cold War system.

In short, the radical critics are probably correct in asserting that the policy concerns of peace researchers have become somewhat maladjusted. To the extent that these efforts focus exclusively on American policy and ignore other clientele, they will both seriously compromise the international orientation of the discipline and quite possibly pass up a number of promising avenues for the peaceful resolution of conflicts. To avoid these difficulties, peace researchers must face squarely the fact that the selection of clientele in policy research involves both scholarly and political choices, and concentrate on making these choices in a way that is consistent with the overall goals of peace research.

#### PEACE RESEARCH AND THE STATUS QUO

In accusing peace research of bias, the radical critique does not stop with the charge of pro-Americanism; for many, the problem is much more fundamental and serious. After all, a basic principle of peace research is the need to avoid national bias, and so, as with the 'knowledge versus action' controversy, it requires no fundamental re-thinking of assumptions to diagnose and correct the problem (Schend, 1968, p. 217). But there may be a form of bias implicit in the principles of peace research themselves, specifically a bias in favour of the status quo.

According to this argument, peace research is devoted to seeking the resolution of conflict by the simplest and most expeditious means possible. Since (i) solutions which involve the preservation and stabilisation of existing structures and institutions often appear less complex and difficult than those which call for their alteration, removal or replacement, and (ii) in the short run the implementation of proposed solutions to conflicts is very largely a monopoly of the power holders in these structures and institutions, 'the universalist ethos of peace research becomes operationalized into identification with . . . the interests of those who have power . . . providing the decision-makers of the system with knowledge for control (and) manipulation' (Schend, 1968, p. 229).

Once again, in so far as this charge refers to the political preferences of peace researchers, it is far from an accurate assessment. Obviously, many vigorously oppose the status quo both in the international system as a whole and within many of its member polities. Moreover, a large majority would probably view peace not as a matter of 'law and order' but as the creation of a situation in which change can take place in less sanguine ways. Nevertheless, it is true that the great bulk of policy-relevant peace research literature is directed towards power-holders or those close to them; indeed, the very use of the term 'policy research' or



'policy implications' betrays the extent to which an official chronicle is taken for granted.<sup>2</sup>

Now, given the basic principle enunciated in the previous section that policy studies inevitably adopt some or all of the values, beliefs and preferences of the clientele they are directed towards, studies oriented towards political elites will almost certainly become imbued with the values of the power structure. And of course the most important, universal, and for that reason unquestioned, value for these elites is the need to retain their power and privilege and to maintain the social, political and economic institutions upon which they rest. Thus, even though many peace research studies call for reforms or changes, these will typically be reinterpreted as necessary to the defence of more important elements in the status quo (Galtung, 1987, p. 2).

Perhaps the most prominent examples of this type of orientation are to be found in the various plans peace researchers have put forward for disarmament and arms control. Almost without exception they operate on the assumption that the chief problem is to avoid allowing any side to gain a military advantage, in other words, the existing distribution of capability in the system must be preserved (Schwede, 1970; Rathjens, 1968). Even when international institutions are located and strengthened so as to render a resort to arms more difficult, this is to be done in a way that would protect the existing material and other advantages of the powerful minority (Wright, 1954, Ch. 2). In addition, almost all such proposals allow the state to retain sufficient forces for 'police' functions; in other words, they allow political elites to enforce the status quo internally as well.

### *Morality and elites*

Now there are three major objections to the adoption of these elite values, the first and most obvious is the moral one. If a given political system harbours blatant repression or injustice, or if a relationship between two or more nations is exploitative or inequitable, there are serious ethical problems involved in advancing policy proposals predicated upon the continuing existence of that system or relationship, however satisfactory these proposals may otherwise be. It is surely not obvious that the needs of those who are disadvantaged or oppressed are less urgent than the need for peace, and even less obvious that these needs can always be satisfied by an incremental modification of the status quo.

Of course, it is an article of faith amongst many peace researchers that there always exists a 'win-win' solution which in the long run will reconcile conflicting interests, if we are only clever enough to find it (Schwede, 1968, p. 230). But then, after all, is only an empirical hypothesis, and not a self-evident truth, given the weight of evidence that seems to contradict it in many cases, it is certainly unwise to pose such an

assumption as sufficient justification for avoiding the moral questions involved. Moreover, given the terrible human cost that the status quo often brings, it is not even obvious that solutions can wait for the 'long run'.

The point is, in many cases there may be no 'optional solution' to the dilemmas posed by conflict (Gilbert, 1970). If there is not, we must make moral and political choices regarding the outcome, and these may very well lead us to reject the politically powerful as clients. In doing so, peace research will inevitably become openly involved not only in the formulation of peace proposals but also in the political process whereby these are translated into action. But lest there be a tendency to weep for lost scholarly innocence, let us recall that this is an inevitable consequence of our growth as an applied science, it is surely better to determine by deliberate choice how we wish to be involved in the political process, than to forgo detachment and have the choice made for us by default.

### *Is peace ethics?*

The moral difficulties involved in tailoring our proposals to suit political elites are by no means the only ones, and in this respect the weakness of the radical critique is not that it goes too far but that it does not go far enough. Radical criticism questions only whether the decision-makers of certain countries will pay any attention to peace research. Left largely unexamined is the broader question of whether political elites *per se* are the best or only agencies for the implementation of peace policies. Granted, these political elites are responsible for most of the violence we seek to minimize and of course the state remains the *vis à vis* of control and influence in the international system. But if, as quite often appears the case, state policy is very unlikely to respond to the proposals of peace researchers, it might be well to ask not only whether political elites are morally acceptable clients, but also whether they are really the groups best able to 'deliver the goods' as measured by the reduction of violence (Rapoport, 1976).

In other words, instead of focusing our policy prescriptions on national-states, their delegated agencies, or international organizations whose powers are derived from states, perhaps we ought to be paying more attention to the policy alternatives, strategies, and tactics of intra-national interest groups, political parties, protest groups, minority organizations, ethnic or religious affiliates, and trans-national cultural and political organizations. The purpose of such a strategy would be twofold: (1) to assist those groups and individuals who seek to curb state violence, and (2) to assist those who are not part of the state structure or its clients in obtaining their basic needs from the political system with a minimum of violence. There is no guarantee, of course, that an

emphasis on these groups would materially improve our chances for peace, but it is at least a possibility, given the singular lack of success we have had in influencing decision-makers that far, it seems foolish to continue to place our eggs in the state's ample basket.

The adoption of non-state actors as potential clientele will of course generate new research priorities. First and foremost will be that of expanding the range of tactics and techniques available to these widely-differing social coalitions. As noted above, the existing literature on nonviolent action is inadequate in that it fails to set forth workable alternatives to violence (Kelman, 1968). If we are serious about minimizing violence in an era where more and more conflicts are becoming zero-sum games, a crucial need is for nonviolent ones. In a technological society there are no doubt many ways an individual or group willing to take the risk could make an illegal but nonviolent 'splash', and of course the past few years have amply demonstrated that the symbolic overthrow of cultural taboos or rituals is often as effective as any bomb in forcing consideration of group interest. Both of these possibilities provides avenues for further research.

But the range of important questions goes beyond mere protest techniques. A great deal of work can and must be done on the strategy of building political coalitions too strong for the state to ignore or smash. One key question, for example, is how under-privileged groups can best attract those within the circle of the powerful who may be willing to support change out of disenchantment or because they fear for the stability of the existing order. Existing research (Lerner, 1966, p. 37) indicates that the best tactic is to emphasize the dimensions of similarity between underdog and target topdog (e.g. 'student is nigger'), as the potent tendency of some minority leaders to emphasize dissimilarities portends ill for their cause. In broader terms, peace research ought to explore ways of systematically creating a 'subversive majority' as an alternative to violent revolution.

#### *The end of the nation-state*

There is another persuasive, albeit long term reason for the adoption of non-state actors as clientele, not only may they prove to be the most effective purveyors of peace in the short run, but they may help lay the foundations of a totally different sort of international system. Many would contend that whatever success we may have in the short run in dampening interstate violence, as long as the world is divided into territorial states, each with a monopoly of violence in its own backyard and in constant and unrestrained competition with others, massive violence is an ever-present danger no matter how well regulated the system (Singer and Wallace, 1973, Wallace, 1976). If that be the case, then the ultimate goal of peace research must be the replacement of the nation-

state system by some other sort of international order better suited to meeting human needs and less prone to violent conflict. Although even the basic outlines of such a system are difficult to envisage at this juncture, it would clearly involve a quantum jump in the number and influence of supra-national, non-national, and transnational actors.

It is surprising, therefore, that peace research has not seen fit to focus on such actors as a primary domain, except in the case of inter-governmental organisations. Since there is little evidence that the world's nation-states intend to abdicate in favour of, or allow themselves to be subverted by, the organisations they themselves have created (Singer and Wallace, 1970), it would seem that the time is long overdue for a complete re-thinking of our approaches in this area, starting from the assumption that other non-national actors must play a crucial role in any systematic restructuring.

Several research strategies suggest themselves. One possible approach would be historical studies of those periods where other forms of international structure were dominant, for example during the High Middle Ages. It might be fruitful as well to look at the impact of technological, social, and economic change on the nation-state structure so as to discern which groups are most likely to emerge as its successor. Finally, it will no doubt prove necessary to examine the behaviour and intentions of these new actors with a view to ensuring that they themselves will not resort to violence.

In summary, then, there is some substance to the charge that peace research has endorsed the status quo to further the cause of peace. However, it is not necessary to argue this question on political grounds; there are good reasons to believe that neither an immediate nor a lasting peace can be achieved by such a marriage. It is to be hoped, therefore, that peace researchers will begin to focus to a greater extent on actors who stand apart from or even opposed to existing structures and ideas, recognising that they may represent less a threat to our goal than the only hope of its ultimate achievement.

#### THE ROLE OF VIOLENCE

A fourth note—and, for many, the crucial axiom of the entire debate—concerns the charge that present-day peace research totally misrepresents the role of violence in human social relations (Nehrborg, 1962). Peace research, it is argued, begins its endeavours with the perfectly justifiable assumption that nuclear Armageddon would be an unparalleled human catastrophe. In dealing with this danger it was quite correct to assume that the maximization of human well-being necessitated the renunciation of violence between the two blocs. But with the relative decline in superpower hostilities and the rise of internationalized civil war and revolutions as objects of widespread scholarly focus, many peace re-

researchers have extended this specific contention into the sweeping judgement that violence is the worst of all possible outcomes in any situation of human conflict (Schmid, 1968). This more general statement, assert the radical critics, is far from being universally true. In fact, a very much greater degree of human misery may result from outcomes where starvation, disease, enslavement, or the 'legal' use of oppressive force prevail. Thus, they contend, it is impossible to justify a position which emphasizes the elimination of violence over the uprooting of poverty and oppression.

If the argument went thus far and no further, there would clearly be a good deal of common ground between 'traditional' peace researchers and its radical critics. Regardless of which of these evils represents the greatest source of human misery and death, both sides would concur in asserting that their collective elimination should take precedence over lesser human goals (Singer and Womack, 1968). Furthermore, if as many peace researchers believe, the roots of both domestic and international violence are to be found to a large extent in the poverty and oppression the radicals describe, then there would be a good deal of convergence between the two views in matters of policy priorities.

But the disagreement is far more profound than this. The real point of division centres over how poverty, injustice and violence are to be eliminated. Peace researchers, claim the radicals, take a simplistic, negative view of violence and thus rule out from the start its use to destroy the structures which maintain poverty, exploitation and repression. This is foolish and unrealistic, they argue, since those who are in command of these structures will simply not yield to anything but force (Moghadam, 1968). In some situations, violence is necessary to bring down or intimidate the powerful into granting the necessary social, economic and political concessions to other nations or oppressed groups. Here, violence or the threat of it is necessary as a bargaining counter to achieve equity, without it there would often be no way of checking tyranny and injustice (Neuberg, 1968). At other times, violence must be used to overthrow the old order completely, at least in those cases where the latter's corruption, stupidity and brutality make compromise impossible.<sup>2</sup> In either case, violence properly used is seen by the radicals not only as a means of abolishing the 'normalised' misery of the under-classes and under-dogs, but also as a means of eventually eliminating violence itself, since they argue that it is the upholder of the old order which generates both this violence and popular counter-violence.

In short, the radical critique denies that peace research can legitimate its efforts to reduce violence by appealing to the common good. Since violence can have a net beneficial effect at certain times and under certain circumstances, the claim that violent actions should not be undertaken regardless of circumstances can only be made by reference to (i) a religious or philosophical belief that violent actions are wrong in

and of themselves, or (ii) a personal preference for or interest in things as they are. Whichever is the case, it amounts to an attempt to cloak private bias in the mantle of universal principle, that is all the more dishonest when coupled with a condemnation of the sadists for introducing such biases into the discipline. Either such biases must be made explicit and the moral and scientific legitimacy of dissent from them conceded, or else the maximisation of human benefit must be placed ahead of the maximisation of violence where these two goals can be shown to diverge.

Now of course it is not difficult to make a plausible case for the opposite view that violence seldom if ever serves the common good (Kelman, 1968). Scholars have argued variously that violence fails to effect change in most instances (Wolf, 1969; Coser, 1967); that even 'successful' violence entails both short and long-run costs greater than any conceivable benefits (Srookin, 1968; Arendt, 1970); that far from diminishing repression, it only generates more (Kelman, 1968); that regardless of initial scope many outbreaks of violence may increase the probability of superpower conflicts and thus of a thermonuclear holocaust (Wright, 1963); and—most important of all—that there do exist alternative, nonviolent means of effecting the same change at vastly reduced cost.

But if it is by no means obvious that the radical critique is correct in its contentions, it is clearly true that these arguments raise two fundamental questions about violence—one normative and one empirical—that peace researchers have been perhaps too willing to ignore or dismiss with sweeping assumptions.

### *The moral dilemma*

Not unexpectedly, the thornier of the two problems is the ethical one. Simply stated it is that: what price are we prepared to pay for an end to violence, or, alternatively, what price in violence are we prepared to pay to achieve other goals? While the policies and strategies that must be pursued to avoid violent conflict may be compatible with many other human accomplishments it can scarcely be doubted they will preclude others. Should this be accepted as inevitable or ought our zeal in reducing violence be tempered by a consideration of other needs?

Of course, it is easy to recognise in this question the echoes of a tired old debate, it recalls the familiar cold war accusation that the discipline subscribes to a philosophy of 'peace at any price', or 'better red than dead'. But in that debate, the values imagined against the abolition of violence were those of narrow nationalism, political partisanship and economic self-interest. What I am suggesting here (and what is implied in the radical critique) is that efforts to eliminate violence may prejudice important goals which we may be reluctant indeed to abandon.

First and foremost, it may be that the savings in life and limb resulting from a reduction or elimination of violence would be effected at the cost of other lives that might be saved or ameliorated by it. If we grant that the most important goal is the preservation of human life (Marlow, 1943; Bay, 1968) and if, as the radicals argue, the status quo leads to death and suffering from privation and disease, violence undertaken to alter the status quo might be justified as a life preserving force. The problem is that in some circumstances, all available alternatives may (directly or indirectly) involve loss of life. But each human life is unique and precious, what permits us to 'trade' some lives for others? Even if we concede that policy should always be directed towards minimizing the net loss of life (Singer and Winston, 1969; Galtung, 1969), there will still remain the question as to whose probability of dying will be minimized. It might turn out that a policy of reducing violence whenever possible will produce disastrous outcomes; we might, for example, end up saving the lives of soldiers at the expense of those of children.

However difficult the moral problem is when only bodily integrity is involved, it becomes more tangled still when other values enter the picture. Considering perhaps the most urgent first, it might be argued (Niebuhr, 1969; Jefferson, 1787) that periodic violence (or, perhaps more important, the fear of it) is necessary to the establishment and maintenance of personal freedom, in any age when technology is equipping both public and private bureaucracies with ever more effective means of surveillance and control, can we really afford to abandon any weapon we might need to use against them? It is surely not outrageous to ask if a few lives lost to violence—at least if they are those of politicians and officials—are not a reasonable price to pay for a tolerable context for all.

A third goal whose achievement may not always be compatible with the complete elimination of violence is human dignity or self-respect. Many have stressed the debilitating and even destructive effects that social prejudice and contempt have upon a judged 'inferior', and insist that the custom—and the damage—of prejudice can only be ended by violence (Faison, 1961). If so, is it not at least questionable whether the elimination of all violence is the first priority?

A fourth and final goal that may be difficult to reconcile with an end to violent conflict at the present time is that of equality. Quite apart from the effects it may have on dignity and life-span, the existence of material well-being and opportunity constitutes a major barrier to human comfort, security and self-fulfilment. Once again, if violence represents the only way at present in which this inequality can be controlled or reduced, on what basis can we say that violence was chosen in error?

Now obviously neither peace researchers nor other critics can give final answers to these questions, nor should they. Ideally, the final

moral decisions concerning what is to be achieved and what is to be sacrificed should be made by all individuals whose lives are affected by them, and at any rate certainly not by Olympian observers. It is therefore incumbent upon peace researchers not to present the world with recipes or strategies in which these moral decisions have already been made implicitly or explicitly. Rather, they should concentrate on maximizing the knowledge and information the actors possess about all the gains and losses associated with all the possible outcomes. The individual actor can (and usually should) participate vigorously in the process of choosing amongst them, but in simple honesty he cannot misrepresent the choices involved, or worse yet, pretend that no choices exist.

#### *The empirical problem*

Now obviously the radicals' moral claim concerning the justifiability of violence is predicated upon a set of empirical assumptions about its efficacy. And no doubt the chief reason why most peace researchers have paid little attention to these moral issues is precisely because they deny the veracity of the radical model of violence and its effects. If violent actions almost never achieve their goals or if they are always more costly than equally effective nonviolent means of goal attainment, then it is scarcely possible to question the morality and honesty of attempts to reduce or eliminate violence.

The problem is that there still exists no conclusive body of evidence which demonstrates that the radical model of violence is in error and that the peace research model is correct. Few statements made on either side of this issue are much more than plausible speculation, and almost never is hard evidence adduced to support the claim-advanced (Jensen, 1966). On this issue, as on so many matters affecting social policy, statements are 'proved' either by unsupported sweeping generalizations or by the 'ransacking' of history to unearth cases which support the contention in question. In effect, both sides take their positions on the issue to be more or less self-evident, thus requiring little or no systematic empirical treatment.

But as the debate itself shows, it is very far from clear what are the effects of violence on human lives and values. Furthermore, for too much is at stake for the matter to be treated in a cavalier fashion. On the one hand, if the radical view is correct then peace research will have to give up its notion that the avoidance of violence is always the causal and moral course, and begin to wrestle with the complex ethical problems outlined above. On the other hand, if that model is seriously in error, then it is the plain duty of peace researchers to marshal all available evidence against its growing popularity. In short, hard evidence about the uses and effects of violence is urgently needed, and while peace researchers cannot by themselves provide answers to the ethical issues in-



solved in the debate, their training and concern should make them the first to tackle the empirical problems. What then are these, and how might peace researchers deal with them?

The first major empirical concern in this regard is of course the matter of gains of violence. It is absurd to speculate whether the gains of violence are worth the costs unless it can be firmly established that there is indeed an entry on the credit side of the ledger. How important is violence to the achievement of human values? A partial answer to this question could be given by studying the statistical relationship between various types of violence undertaken by and for underprivileged groups and nations and improvements in their condition. Of course, even if a positive correlation were discovered, it would still be open to question whether the observed relationship was not due to a statistical artifact or the action of some other variable. Thus the test population must be sufficiently large to permit statistical controls holding constant square behavior, level of development, rate of economic growth, etc., in there still a visible relationship between violence and social improvement?

The second major question follows from the first: what are the losses incurred in the use of violence? How many are killed as a direct consequence, and how many die indirectly as a result of wounds, disease and starvation? How much freedom, dignity, well-being and self-expression are lost as a result of these struggles? And—most important of all—what is the ratio of these gains and losses? Is violence on the whole 'cost-effective'? Here we are interested not in the correlation between violence and its beneficial consequences but in the slope and intercept of the equation given by regressing the losses on the gains. How much loss of value is required to produce a unit gain? And what is the partial regression slope once the variables referred to above have been controlled for?

A third set of questions concerns the manner in which cost-effectiveness varies both over the observational universe and with the indicators employed. What kinds of violence (terror, riots, armed clashes) produce the most favorable balance of gain and loss? Does the ratio vary with the amount of violence employed? Is it the case that violence only proves effective under certain conditions of social mobilization, maturity, or growth? How is its utility affected by the availability of other means to achieve change? And what influence do cultural and personality variables have? To answer these questions about the possible non-additivity of the relationship between violence and value, it will be necessary to conduct studies on the effects of violence using a large observational universe on a wide variety of indicators.

The fourth and last set of questions concerns the relative effectiveness of violence and alternative courses of action. Are threats of violence

as effective as violence itself? In what circumstances does violence produce better results than actions deemed legitimate by the political system? How useful have nonviolence or passive resistance strategies proved by comparison with armed struggle? If violence proves to be the only solution, what are the ways in which its benefits can be maximised and its losses reduced? And can any new nonviolent strategies be devised which will match the effectiveness? To answer these questions, peace researchers must not only compare the effects of violence with those of the appropriate other variables in studies employing historical data, but also use simulation to try and determine the effectiveness of nonviolent tactics which have thus far been employed only seldom in real-life situations.

Now obviously any rigorous answers to these questions will require a great deal of careful theorising and hypothesis generation, index construction, data-making, and analysis (Walker and Van Vaneveld, 1970). But the point is that such questions are no different in principle from those concerning the causes of violence and conflict, and will no doubt yield to the same scientific methods. This being the case, there is no reason why anyone—regardless of their position on the use of violence—should be satisfied with existing answers or scorn attempts to produce better ones. With such hard evidence in hand, peace researchers will be far better equipped than they are at present to assist those stretched in the brutal and complex struggles of the contemporary era.

#### CONCLUSION

The new debate over the future of peace research has made it increasingly clear that many of the comfortable beliefs and assumptions which peace-oriented scholars have held regarding the purpose and impact of their work on the outside world may be extended or salvaged. If the discipline is not to abandon its original goal of providing the insight and knowledge needed to create a more livable world, there will have to be a good deal of rethinking and reformulation of its basic premises.

This does not mean—as I hope is made clear above—that everyone must drop what they are doing in favour of something else. On the contrary, virtually all of the research activities peace researchers are presently engaged in are urgently needed to answer basic questions about the nature and role of violence in the international system. What it does imply, however, is that those who focus on the most traditional peace research problems must make room within the discipline for those who seek to supplement these with new questions and concerns. For their part, radical peace researchers would do well to remember that their own basic goals—an end to oppressive and destructive rule, the most equitable distribution of human value and in general the pacification of existence—could have no better intellectual servant than a pragmatic, activist and international inquiry oriented towards the 'detour

to death' (Maruse, 1966) that is the lot of so many. If the discipline has not thus far met the expectations of many, it is cause for further action and not abandonment of hope; nothing is to be gained by substituting rhetoric for science.

## REFERENCES

- Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1969.
- Christina Bay, 'Politics and Pseudo-politics', *American Political Science Review*, V 59, No. 1 (March 1965), pp 39-51.
- Henry Blaum, *Violence and Social Change: A Review of Current Literature*, University of Chicago, 1968.
- Herbert M. Blalock, 'The Identification Problem and Theory Building: The Case of Status Inconsistency', *American Sociological Review*, V. 31 (1966), pp. 52-63.
- Anders Brestrup and Claus Iversen, 'Demonstrations as a Source of Change', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1966, No. 4, pp. 323-341.
- Robert R. Bowie, 'Basic Requirements of Arms Control', in Donald C. Branson (ed.), *Arms Control, Disarmament, and National Security*, George Braziller, N.Y., 1961.
- Urie Bronfenbrenner, 'The Mirror Image in Soviet-American Relations: A Social Psychologist's Report', *Journal of Social Issues*, V 17, No. 3 (1961), pp. 45-56.
- William R. Czapary, Open letter to the Peace Research Society (International), November 11, 1969.
- Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, *World Peace Through World Law*, (3rd ed.), Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1966.
- Lewis A. Coser, *Contestation in the Study of Social Conflict*, Free Press, N.Y., 1967.
- Lars Deuch et al, Resolution submitted to the Peace Research Society (International) Conference, Copenhagen, August, 1969.
- Franz Fanon, *Les Damnés de la Terre*, Editions Maspéro, Paris, 1961.
- Johan Galtung, 'Tragedy from a Sociological Point of View', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V. 3, No. 1 (June 1959), pp. 63-84.
- Johan Galtung, 'On the Meaning of Nonviolence', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1965, No. 3, pp. 221-257.
- Johan Galtung, 'Peace Research: Science of Politics in Dagone?', (unpubl.), 1967.
- Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1969, No. 3, pp. 167-191.
- Arthur N. Gilbert, 'International Relations and the Spirit of Tragedy', *Palestine Review*, V 60, No. 1 (Autumn, 1970), pp. 43-52.
- Walter Lard (ed.), *Problems: Some Basic Issues and Alternatives*, Seaborn Co., Cambridge (Mass.), 1969.
- Thomas Jefferson, letter to James Madison, Jan. 30, 1787, in J.P. Boyd,

- (ed.), *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, V 2, Princeton University Press, 1958, pp. 92-93.
- Journal of Peace Research*, editorial, 1964, No. 1, pp. 1-2.
- Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry*, Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco, 1964.
- Herbert C. Kellman, *A Time to Speak*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1968.
- V.I. Lenin, 'The State and Revolution', *Lenin, Selected Works*, V. 2, pp. 263-361.
- Gerhard Lenski, *Power and Privilege*, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1966.
- Herbert Marcuse, *Free and Civilization*, (2nd ed.), Beacon Press, Boston, 1966.
- A.H. Maslow, 'A Theory of Human Motivation', *Psychological Review*, V. 50 (1943), pp. 170-196.
- Seymour Melsman, *Peacemaking Capitalism*, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1970.
- Edward Mondlane, 'Violence: Not Whether But How Much', in George Vickers (ed.), *Dialogue on Violence*, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1968.
- H. Nieburg, 'The Use of Violence', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 7, No. 1 (March 1963), pp. 43-55.
- H. Nieburg, *Political Violence: The Behavioural Process*, St. Martin's Press, N.Y., 1969.
- Antoni Rapoport, 'Is Peace Research Applicable?', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 14, No. 2 (Sept. 1970), pp. 277-286.
- George C. Rathjens, *The Future of the Strategic Arms Race: Options for the 1970s*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, N.Y., 1969.
- Adam Roberts, *The Strategy of Criminal Defence*, Faber and Faber, London, 1967.
- Raoul M. Ruess, 'The Calculus of Deterrence', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 3, No. 2 (June 1959), pp. 138-145.
- Herfried Schend, 'Peace Research and Politics', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1968, No. 3, pp. 247-252.
- David C. Schwartz, 'From Political Theory to Peace Policy: Notes on a More Structured Peace Research Process', *Peace Research Society Papers*, V. 11 (1968), pp. 43-46.
- Herbert Scoville, Jr., *Towards a Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, N.Y., 1970.
- Mulford Q. Soble (ed.), *The Quiet Battle*, Doubleday, N.Y. 1963.
- Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Harper and Row, N.Y., 1925.
- J. David Singer, 'The Levels of Analysis Problem in International Relations', *World Politics*, V. 14, (1962), pp. 77-92.
- J. David Singer and Paul Warten, 'Individual Values, National Interest, and Political Development in the International System', paper

presented to the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

- I. David Singer, 'Knowledge, Practice, and Social Science in International Politics', in Norman D. Palmer, (ed.), *A Design for International Relations Research: Scope, Theory, Methods and Reference*, American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1970.
- J. David Singer and Michael D. Wallace, 'International Organization and the Preservation of Peace, 1815-1964: Some Basic Relationships', *International Organization*, V 24 No 3, (Summer 1970) pp. 529-547.

Michael D. Wallace, 'Power, Status, and the International War', *Journal of Peace Research*, 1971, No 1, pp 23-35

Michael D. Wallace, *Status Insecurity, Physical Mobility and International War, 1820-1964*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970

Michael D. Wallace, 'Status, Formal Organization, and Arms Levels as Factors Leading to the Onset of War, 1820-1964', in Bruce M. Russett (ed.), *War, Peace, and Numbers*, Sage Publications, N.Y., 1972.

Michael D. Wallace and Gail van Varsenold, 'Violence as a Technique of Social Change: Toward an Empirical Assessment', paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, June 1970

Ralph K. White, 'Images in the Context of International Conflict: Soviet Perceptions of the U.S. and the USSR', in Herbert C. Kelman, *International Behaviour*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, N.Y., 1965.

Ralph K. White, 'Quantification and the Crucial Intangibles', in Norman D. Palmer, *supra*, 1970

Eric R. Wolf, *Primitive Wars of the Twentieth Century*, Harper and Row, N.Y., 1969.

Arnold Wolfers, 'Disarmament, Peacekeeping and the National Interest' in Arnold Wolfers et al., *The United States and a Divided World*, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1966

Quincy Wright, 'The Evolution of International Conflicts', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, V 9, No 4, (Dec 1965), pp 434-448

Quincy Wright, *Problems of Stability and Progress in International Relations*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1954

---

□ From the paper presented to the Meeting of the Peace Research Society (International), Western Region, at the University of Washington, Seattle, February 18, 1971

1. Throughout this paper, references will continuously be made to the 'radical anti-ques', the 'radical criticism' and even 'the radicals'. The reader should understand these terms as a convenient shorthand used to identify a set of closely-related opinions about peace research held by a number of different scholars. No claim is being made that they represent precisely the views of any single person, nor that all who would call themselves 'radicals' subscribe to them or any other opinions. Although some might quarrel with the use of labels here, the point is not really relevant to the purpose of this paper, which is not to decide what so-and-so 'really meant,' or what such-and-such 'really is', but rather to discuss the substance of these new opinions of the discipline.
2. Of course, such things have happened in the history of science. Lysenko's biology is perhaps the most recent case.
3. For a discussion of the difficulties such cases involve, see Black (1966) and Wallace (1971).
4. A good illustration of this is the collection of studies on Vietnam edited by Lind (1969) which has become something of a case *study* in this respect. Although the purpose of the volume may have been 'to chart out more thoroughly and systematically the alternatives which participants in conflict situations might adopt', virtually all the papers spoke to the problem of U.S. policy, and were only tangentially relevant to the policy problems of the other protagonists.
5. The only exceptions to this are the studies of nonviolent resistance to civil disobedience that have appeared in peace research literature (Roberts, 1963; Selby, 1963; Oakung, 1974, 1965; Katsura, 1968; Bessing and Iversen, 1966) and which are obviously aimed at those without political influence. Unfortunately, these are not widely referred to numerically, but also tend to focus more on the strategy, history, and normative foundations of such science rather than on their potential applications. Moreover, with occasional brilliant exceptions, these efforts have lacked the rigour and social science sophistication we have come to demand from peace research.
6. The rationale behind this provision is perhaps spelled out most clearly in Lewis (1977).

# *Looking into the future: 1950-1970*

---

## A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Roderick Soderberg, *Post-historic Man. An Inquiry*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1950

History is a short transitional phase of man's total development, in which instinct and intelligence vie with one another for dominance. Eventually intelligence will completely dominate instinct. When this occurs, man will enter the post-historic period of his development.

Charles G. Darwin, *The Next Million Years*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1953

The fundamental features of the future will be laid down by over-population. A segment of humanity will always be starving because of scarce food supplies. The present era will be viewed as a past 'golden age' because the future will be typified by sporadic conventional wars between independent dictatorial provinces.

J.G. de Bois, *The Future of the West*, New York, Harper, 1953

The creative spirit of the West will produce a single world society. It could come into being through a major war or through an extended period of peace. America is destined to spearhead the transformation of the future, while Europe will be its active ally.

Harrison Brown, *The Challenge of Man's Future*, New York, Viking Press, 1954

There seem to be three possible futures open to man, depending on how he solves his present dilemma. The first, and most likely, is the co-emergence of an agrarian world in the aftermath of a major nuclear war. The second possibility is a 'completely controlled, collectivized

industrial society'. The third possibility, which is the most desirable and least likely, is a fully industrialized world in which everyone leads a comfortable and satisfying existence.

Robert L. Heifman, *The Future as History*, New York, Harper, 1960.

Blind optimism and trust in the goodness of tomorrow will no longer suffice. The challenges of tomorrow can be met only if a new philosophy is developed that recognizes and accepts the inevitable aspects of the future while trying to shape the other aspects in the most desirable fashion.

Fred L. Polak, *The Image of the Future: Enlightening the Past, Guiding the Present, Forecasting the Future*, New York: Omega Publications, 1961.

The rise and fall of civilization is preceded by the rise and fall of dominant images of the future. Modern western civilization is dominated by negative images of the future. The greatest danger to western culture, therefore, is its lack of an idealistic image of the future. Man is in a better position to fashion the kind of society he desires than ever before, but without new images of an ideal future to guide his striving, his civilization is doomed.

Roderick Seidenberg, *Anatomy of the Future*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Man's basic dilemma is that while his traditional values are no longer appropriate to a society structured by the dictates of organizational efficiency, he is unable to change his values because his spontaneous creative impulses have been so severely limited by societal regimentation.

Arthur C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future*, New York, Harper & Row, 1962.

It is impossible to predict the actual future in any details. The best one can hope to do is to delineate the general direction that development might take. In addition, imagination is as necessary for good prediction as is scientific knowledge.

Ferdinand Lundberg, *The Coming World Transformations*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1961.

An analysis of past predictions shows that social predictions are in many ways just as reliable as predictions made for scientific phenomena. A theory of social prediction can be formulated by isolating those factors that make forecasts of socio-cultural change possible.



Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society*, New York, Knopf, 1964

The future will bring a dictatorship of technocrats more oppressive than any man has yet experienced. Various aspects of modern life, especially the economy and the government, are rapidly becoming dominated by the technical orientation. This trend will continue until man becomes completely lost in his technological society and totally subservient to its dictates of rationality and efficiency.

Dennis Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, New York, Knopf, 1964

Our civilization faces three great dangers, nuclear war, over-population, and an age of leisure. If the first two dangers come to pass, man will know how to react. Should the Age of Leisure become a reality, man will be unprepared to deal with it because of its novelty. In the past half century he has made tremendous strides toward abolishing work, but he has done little to prepare himself psychologically for his new leisure.

Georgy Palocz-Harvath, *The Future Behold: The Future of Russia and the West*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1964

Both Russia and the United States are changing very rapidly as a result of new technological developments. As they change, they are coming closer together and their problems are becoming similar. Should they succeed in becoming less ideologically rigid in their politics, they might achieve a reconciliation and cooperate in facing the challenges of the future, thereby serving all mankind.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*, London, Collins, 1964.

The greatest challenge facing twentieth-century man is the creation of worthwhile long-range goals. If mankind is to survive, it must rebuild faith in the future by specifying goals that everyone can strive for.

Kenneth E. Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century*, New York, Harper & Row, 1963

Man is coming to the end of a long transitional period, and is about to enter the 'post-civilized' stage of his history. To reach his new stage of development he must avoid the following 'traps'. (1) nuclear war, (2) overpopulation; (3) exhaustion of energy resources, and (4) atrophy of creativity due to lack of existential challenge. To overcome these problems man should use all the intellectual resources at his disposal to create an image of the future, or a set of long-range goals, towards which he can strive.

Oswig K. Flechtman, *History and Futurology*, Mannheim am Glan (Germany), Verlag Anton Hain, 1966

History is 'an endless Odyssey' of unexpected adventures and difficulties and the future is a continuation of the Odyssey with new and unanticipated challenges. However, due to the great acceleration of the pace of change, the future has suddenly emerged as an entity that is completely different from the past. Therefore, the future and its impact on the past and present become worthy of investigation. Though futurology may not enable man to manipulate what is to come, it will help him to anticipate it and thereby make it more bearable.

Hauro Ozobekhan, *Technology and Man's Future*, Santa Monica, Calif., System Development Corporation, 1966

Long-range social goals ought to guide future technological progress rather than vice versa. This, however, will require a clearer specification of just what type of goals ought to be striven for.

Nigel Calder, *The Environment Game*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1967.

Widespread utilization of the soil is not the most appropriate method of producing the food needed by the modern world. Agriculture ought to be replaced by artificial methods of food production. Our whole future way of life could be restructured if the land now devoted to food production could be used for other purposes.

Herman Kahn and Anthony J. Wiener, *The Year 2000: A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-Three Years*, New York, Macmillan, 1967

Basically there are three developmental possibilities: (1) a peaceful, prosperous world with a good deal of arms control and political coordination; (2) a peaceful, prosperous world with no arms control or political coordination; and (3) a violent, troubled world often on the brink of a major war.

Stuart Chase, *The Most Probable World*, New York, Harper & Row, 1961.

The key to overcoming undesirable aspects of the future—unseen population growth trends, diminution of individual 'living space', spread and growth of dense urban areas and configuration of the arms race—lies in a rapid spread of mass education and systematic application of new and existing knowledge to problem areas.

Paul Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society*, New York, Harper & Row, 1968

Two dominant trends will emerge and help to shape the future society that is, far-reaching changes in technology will cause continued concern with production and productivity; and organizations will become a central part of society, thereby serving man rather than enslaving him. It seems, therefore, that the major tasks of the future will involve making personnel improvements in the social fabric rather than creating it anew.

Donald N. Michael, *The Unprepared Society. Planning for a Precarious Future*, New York, Basic Books, 1968

It is quite likely that two types of culture will emerge in the future: one for those who can cope with change and one for those who cannot. To prevent this kind of split, people must be better prepared for life in tomorrow's highly complex world. A whole new approach to education will be required.

Gerald Feinberg, *The Prometheus Project: Mankind's Search for Long Range Goals*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1968

The need to create long-range goals for the whole world arises from two modern trends: (1) interdependence of nations, and (2) the emergence of a technology that enables a limited number of people to make earth-shaking decisions whose effects they are unable to foresee. General agreement on such goals might serve as a bridge between opposing ideologies.

Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope: Towards a Humanized Technology*, New York, Harper & Row, 1968

We are at the crossroads: one road leads to a completely mechanized society, with man as a helpless cog in the machine, the other to a continuance of humanism and hope, to a society that puts technique in the service of man's well-being. To make the latter a reality, we must: (1) develop 'humanistic planning', (2) channel the general discontent into continual action and participatory democracy, (3) restructure consumption patterns, (4) develop a modern equivalent for traditional religious forms.

John B. Platt, *The Step to Man*, New York, Wiley, 1968

Man's greatest problems lie in correctly anticipating consequences, and in applying his intellect to concerted action that will effectively reduce his needs and tensions.

Stuart L. Udell, 1978) *Agenda for Tomorrow*, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1968.

We will not attain radiant cities unless our minds encompass the foundations of a radiant social order as well. Our ideas for cities, for conservation, and for social justice must coalesce in a single, interrelated concept.

Robert U. Ayres, *Technological Forecasting and Long-Range Planning*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969.

The direction and rate of future technological progress depends upon adequate planning based on insightful forecasts.

John McHale, *The Future of the Future*, New York, George Brander, 1969.

When thinking about and planning for the future it is imperative to throw off the mental constraints that past traditions or ideologies impose. This is especially true when trying to create the single world community that the future requires.

Victor C. Perkins, *Technological Man: The Myth and the Reality*, New York, George Brander, 1968.

A world society can become a reality if 'technological man' becomes dominant by the end of the century. At present this new species is far outnumbered by 'bourgeois man' who has no comprehension of the modern world's essential nature and uses its technology for limited and selfish ends. It is the continued predominance of this type that threatens man's future survival rather than his scientific advances per se.

Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock*, New York, Random House, 1970.

'Future shock' occurs when the society in which one lives alters its basic character so drastically that old behaviour patterns are no longer valid or useful. Unless man becomes able to overcome this type of shock by learning to cope with rapid change, any effort to plan for the future will be ineffective.

---

□ Selected and abridged from Wendell Bell and James A. Mead, *The Secrecy of the Future*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

## IN BACK NUMBERS

**1969**

**January**

William R. Miller : Gandhi and King—Pioneers of Modern Nonviolence

T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to the Study of Gandhi

S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

**April**

A Controversy : The Meaning of Gandhi

Robert Payne : The Inheritance of Gandhi

Israel Do Sola Pool : Violence in Villages

Stuart Nelson : Caste and Untouchability—and Gandhi

**July**

R.R. Dinker : The Lokasaysa and the Mahatma

Shabari Bhattacharya : Some Reflections on Gandhi the Writer

Esme Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and the God-Idea

S. M. Theari : Four Questions on Gandhi's Philosophy

**October**

Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and Social Revolution

A. S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social Philosophy

Reedina Scherer : The Obligations of the Individual

B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as a Source of his Influence

**1970**

**January**

Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and Dissent in America

George Lakey : Strategy for Non-violent Revolution

James E. Bristol : The Draft Respell Movement in the United States

Johanna Bosch : Erikson's Gandhi

**April**

T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Adwaita of Mahatma Gandhi

K. G. Sanyal : Gandhi's Lovable Personality

P. Nagaraja Rao : The Gandhian Concept of Dharma

Lyn Seaman : Totalitarianism or Nonviolence?

**July**

Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of Citizenship

K. Santhanam : Gandhi's Way of Life

R. R. Dinker : Dynamics of Ahimsa

Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National Defence Strategist

**October**

Grant Code : The Gana : 1914-1918

James D. Hunt : Thoreau and Gandhi : A Re-evaluation of the Legacy

T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in the Seventies

T.K.R. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

1971

January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

Ea Lenarh-Pawlowaska : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

April

James W. Douglass : The Resurrection in the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

H. S. S. Khil : Techniques and Tools of Gandhian Revolution

K. Gupstower : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

July

Gerald Hurrell : The Idea of a Mass Devotic Movement

Johan Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murli : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

October

Karek Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Celia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U. S. Navy

Ramkrishnarao Velury : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

January

S. Tucci : A Meditation on Gandhi  
Donald H. Bishop : The Presuppositions of Nonviolence

Mandranjan Jha : Gandhi, Civil Disobedience and American Officials

R.S. Mohandhar : The Theory of Resistance in Ancient India

April

Symposium : India After Bangla Desh

Homer A. Jack : The India-Pakistan Crisis at the U.N.

W. L. Gargas Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Marie B. Syles : Needful Basis of Violence and Nonviolence

July

Leola Mumford : The Pentagon of Power

James Warren Gould : The Future of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Dheaker : Sri Aurobinda's Philosophy : Its Universal

James W. Douglass : The Yang of Resistance and Yin of Temptation

October

Margie Friedman : The Community of Otherness and the Covert of Peace

James E. Bristol : Nonviolence not First for Export

James J. Preston : Religion and Political Process in Gandhi and Tolstoy

GANDHI MARS  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

ISSN 0013-2544 PUBLISHED BY AND PRINTED AT CENTRAL EXHIBITION LICENCE NO. 100-01-72

2/10

17/4

VOL.-17. No 4. OCT. 1973.

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

# GANDHI MARG

DASGUPTA □ DEVDUTT □ DIWAKAR □ DURGADAS □  
MACHWE □ MAJUMDAR □ MANKEKAR □ PATIL  
□ RANGACHARI □ RAO □ SEN □ TYABJI □ ILLICH  
□ UNNITHAN □ TRIPATHI □ BAHUGUNA □ HYSLOP

## IN BACK NUMBERS

**1967**

**January**

V. S. Narayana : Some Reflections on Optimism  
William Robert Miller : Violence and the Christian Ethic  
Josephine Holcomb : Gandhi at the Round Table Conference  
P. Nagendra Rao : Gandhi and the Hindu Concept of Ahimsa

**April**

Thomas Merton : Terror and the Absurd  
Theodor Ebert : The Meaning of Nonviolent Resistance  
Jerzy Sawicki : The Perspectives of Peace Research  
Horace Alexander : Ends and Means in the Pursuit of Peace

**July**

Martin Luther King : The Causes of the War in Vietnam  
John R. Raser : The Concept of Deterrence  
R. R. Diwakar : Gandhi and Man in Evolution  
Theodor Ebert : Nonviolence : Doctrine or Technique?

**October**

J. B. Kripalani : The Meaning of Swadeshi  
Donald H. Bishop : Gandhi and the Concept of Love  
Karem Monsoor and Martin Grotjahn : Racial Prejudice and the Indian Taboo  
T. V. Parvati : Tilak and Gandhi

**1968**

**January**

Martin Luther King : The Crisis in America's Cities  
Marie B. Bylen : Truth is God  
Jagaprakash Narayan : The Outlook for Peace in India  
Ralph David Abernethy : Religion and World Peace

**April**

Robert Steele : The American Dream Becomes a Nightmare  
Bo Wismarck : The Changing Ideology of Nonviolence  
T.K. Mahadevan : Democracy and the New Generation  
Noam Chomsky : The Revolutionary Potential of A. J. Muste

**July**

Maurice Friedman : Martin Luther King: An American Gandhi and a Modern Job  
Mortford Q. Sibley : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Revolution  
Stuart Nelson : Black Power and the Poor People's Campaign  
Adam Roberts : Martin Luther King and Nonviolent Resistance

**October**

James W. Douglass : Is there a Politics without Violence?  
Geoffrey Ashe : Can Nonviolence Change Society?  
H.J.N. Horsburgh : Nonviolence and Impatience  
R. R. Diwakar : Truth and Nonviolence : New Dimensions

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI



# GANDHI MARG 67

JOURNAL OF THE GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER FOUR OCTOBER 1973

## Editors

G. Ramachandran  
T. K. Mahadevan

## Editorial Board

R. R. Dinker  
J. B. Kripalani  
Jayaprakash Narayan  
Abd. Hussain  
Vijayl Hari  
G. Ramachandran  
Shrinani Narayan  
Bharati Prasad Misra  
Radhakrishna  
Devendra Kumar Gupta  
T. K. Mahadevan (Convener)



# Contents

|                       |     |   |
|-----------------------|-----|---|
| Editorial             | 257 | The yet lingering cares   |
| Symposium             | 261 | Towards a counter-civilisation                                      |
| Ivan Illich           | 266 | School: the sacred cow  |
| T. K. N. Unnikrishnan | 304 | A gandhian perspective of social change in India since independence |
| S. D. Tripathi        | 311 | Experiments in trusteeship management                               |
| K. P. Bhargava        | 323 | Imperatives of education for liberation                             |
| Thomas Hyslop         | 329 | Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—III                   |

GANDHI MAG., 1957-1973, AVAILABLE IN MICROFORM FROM

Keesa University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA; 35 Mobile Drive, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4A 1B6; University Microfilms Limited, St. John's Road, Tyler's Green, Peter, Buckinghamshire, England

U ISSN 2014-4817

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CARD NO. 75-47114

Rs. 7.50 a year in South Asia : \$ 2.50 elsewhere : postage Rs. 2.00 (R 1.00) the copy. Payment in advance. Publication dates : 15 Jan., 15 Apr., 15 Jul., 15 Oct. Complains about non-receipt : (inland) within 15 days : (foreign) within 45 days. Remittances by bank drafts or postal or money orders only. Published by T. K. Mahadewan for the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 221-223 Dena Deyal Upadhyaya Marg, New Delhi 110 001 and printed by him at the Kapur Printing Press, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110 023

# Editorial

---

## THE YET LINGERING CURSE

This is the curse of untouchability in India. It is an ancient curse. But somehow it has persisted through uncounted centuries poisoning and corroding life in India. This proves how deep the roots of untouchability have penetrated into the life of our people. Untouchability, however, is only the diabolical symptom of a fatal disease in the blood and bone of India. That disease is the caste system. We are sometimes inclined to look back into the ancient past and remember the concept of varnashrama dharma on which our society was structured, on the four broad divisions of brahmana, kshatriya, vaishya and shudra, and beyond them the so-called uncharted waters in which lived the pariahs. The pariahs were the untouchables. But as the broad waters of these four divisions of society rolled down the pathways of time, they broke up into hundreds of water-tight compartments, in each of which life was held in prison and which thus stagnated and poisoned. The result is the present caste system; and the roots of untouchability are deep down in that system.

It is some consolation to recall that from time to time great moral and spiritual giants broke through the iron walls of the caste system and held aloft the philosophy of love, compassion and equality for all men. We had first the Buddha who admitted the pariahs into the Sangha and then delivered a mighty blow on the caste system. From the Buddha to Gandhi we have had an unbroken chain of saints and sages who held out their hands to the untouchables. Among them, Ramanuja was perhaps the most courageous and uncompromising. He risked his life for the emancipation of the untouchables. But all these great masters, with only a conspicuous difference in the case of Gandhi, have come and gone, and yet the caste system, along with the curse of untouchability, still survives in India. Even in this year of grace 1973 the poison of untouchability creeps again and again.

Why do we say there was a difference in the case of Gandhi?

While other great masters held out their hands to uplift the untouchables, Gandhi identified himself with them completely. He did not merely preach the doctrine of compassion but made the whole of his life embody that compassion in practice. When he adopted a little parish girl as his own daughter and brought the child and had it on the lap of his wife, who had only four sons and no daughter, a shudder went through caste-ridden India. Gandhi risked his life again and again when he organized a mass movement for Harijan liberation. With Gandhi this was not a political issue but a moral and spiritual one under which no one in India could accept untouchability and still call himself a Hindu. Gandhi's aim was not individual purification but the purification of a whole people and their religion. Because of his colonial moral authority and organizing ability millions of Hindus stood with him and acted with him. That was how temples were opened to the Harijans and how drastic legislation was enacted by Parliament and state legislatures, removing every legal bar impeding the fullest justice and equality to Harijans. The Harijans now have full and adequate representation in Parliament and the legislatures. They are a power to be reckoned with in the India of today. The higher castes and the political parties are all now courting their support. And yet, alas, the caste system still prevails and untouchability poisons the life of our people.

Long ago there was an illuminating controversy between Gandhi and Ambedkar. Gandhi now stands out in history as the saviour of the Harijans and Ambedkar will always be remembered as the dauntless champion of the untouchables. Ambedkar told Gandhi that it was no use fighting untouchability alone but that the battle must be a straight and valiant one against the caste system itself. His words were 'As long as there is caste, there will be the outcasts, i.e., the untouchable.' Gandhi's answer was equally prophetic when he said that the whole caste system was nothing but one of graded untouchability, from the brahmins down to the shudra, and that if the ultimate of untouchability affecting millions of untouchables was destroyed the whole caste system would crumble like a house of cards. Both were right. Ambedkar was right in theory. Gandhi's task, however, was not to pronounce a theory however correct but to go into battle, taking millions with him, against untouchability. Untouchability was the highest common factor of evil and in the fight against it Gandhi succeeded in marshalling every section of the people. He thus enlisted without explicit commitment these millions in a battle against the caste system also.

When the upper castes joined in the struggle against untouchability, it became imperative that they moved away progressively from the caste system. The writer has personally witnessed this phenomenon in innumerable situations as the Harijan liberation movement gathered strength under the mighty leadership of Gandhi. The battle against untouchability

lay released untold moral forces in the country which were later harnessed in a straight battle against the caste system. Gandhi asked not for concessions to the untouchables but for atonement by the so-called high castes. The only atonement he prescribed was identification with the Harijans and a complete social integration between the upper castes and the untouchables. Unique transformations of character and outlook emerged in the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, ushering in a new climate of hope and fulfilment for the Harijans.

And yet why is the caste system still with us and why is untouchability causing its poisonous head to often in our country? This is the question we must answer without any equivocation. We cheered the Buddha and Ramana and in our own time we have cheered Dayananda Saraswati, Vivekananda and Sri Narayana Guru of Kerala. Are we engaged in the process of betraying Gandhi also? The truth of the matter is we cannot betray Gandhi. He is unbetrayable as he symbolised the truth of this cause. Harijan liberation is no longer a question mark. It is a reality. It has yet to be completed. We have no doubt it will be completed. But before that happens we have to do many things. We are doing some of them but not all.

The first thing to be made clear beyond the shadow of a doubt is that the future of the Harijans now lies in their own hands. They must develop more courage, determination and organising ability. They must stand together as one man throughout India and insist on their rights. They have secured many rights but they must go forward and secure all the rest. This includes not only political, economic and educational rights but the right to have the door open for their complete integration with the rest of Indian society. Every taboo against social intercourse and integration must be removed by law and practice. Perhaps the Government is doing its duty more than the people. In the struggles for the capture of political power people have forgotten the basic challenges of nation building, among which the fullest liberation of the untouchables is the most vital. The upper castes will not be able to maintain the crutches of the caste system much longer. The time is therefore ripe for the Harijans to move forward in their last-ditch battle to liberate themselves completely. There are no insurmountable obstacles. Every Harijan child must be brought up in an awareness of his complete equality within the Republic of India. Perhaps the Harijans are waiting for a leader outside Government, who will not be swayed either by the goodwill of the Government or the illwill of the upper castes. We need today a leader of the Harijans from the Harijans and for the Harijans. Unfortunately the most outstanding among our Harijan leaders are inside Government and preoccupied with many other issues. We do not have even a Cabinet Minister for completing the steps needed to achieve the fullest liberation of the Harijans.

While thus the Harpists must strive for themselves with valiant courage and determination, there is a solemn duty cast on the other Hindu sections. We also need a valiant caste-breaking leader to emerge from them. Gandhi's greatest contribution against untouchability and caste came from his moral leadership. After Gandhi our most outstanding non-official leaders have been Acharya Vinoba and Jayaprakash Narayan. Neither of them has picked up the gauntlet against the caste system for a battle unto death to destroy this all-corroding evil. They have, of course, spoken and written against the evil but this has made no dent on it. At the moment the voice of Mrs Indira Gandhi is the most strident and compelling in this cause.

Recently the Sarva Sava Sangh held a notable conference in Sevagram. But nothing has emerged from it of any significance in this war against the caste system. There can be no sarvodaya with the caste system existing in society. Sarvodaya and caste are contradictory terms and yet we do not know how many of the sarvodaya leaders and workers themselves are completely free from this poison. Socialism and the caste system can never coexist together. One must defeat the other. Democracy can never function when caste decides the voting. Poverty is also inextricably mixed with the caste system. The lower the caste the greater the poverty. All this is known to everybody. Everyone knows but few really care. That is the tragedy of the situation. The total eradication of caste and the consequent disappearance of untouchability depend on the character of the Indian people. It is at this point that we realise the heart-breaking truth that character has seldom been weaker in India than it is today. But we must not despair. Each one of us must do our best. No one can do better than his best. We must go on striving without defeat. We must gather together those who stand with us and offer unyielding and continuous battle. We will certainly win because history is with us and the changing conditions of Indian and world society are with us. Let us therefore keep our courage, effort and hope alive and looking hard.

G. RAMAKRISHNAN

# Towards a counter-civilization

---

## A SYMPOSIUM

SUGATA DASGUPTA

DEVIJIT

R. N. DEWEKAR

DIBYADAS

PRABHAKAR MACHWE

R. C. MARUMBER

D. R. MANERKAR

R. K. PATIL

S. RAMGOOLAM

P. KODANDA RAO

MOHIT SONI

RADE-UD-DIN TARIQ

## THE THESIS

- ☐ The quintessence of Gandhi's political philosophy is to be found in *Hind Swaraj*, the quaint little tract that he wrote way back in 1908. Neglected over the years, modern systematic scholarship has revealed it for what it is—as the authentic ‘Gandhi Manifesto’.
- ☐ Gandhi's central theme in *Hind Swaraj* is that modern technology is destructive of human autonomy and freedom and that the affluence and power it brings is not worth the candle. Instead of trying to keep up with the Joneses, Gandhi argued, India should celebrate the art of living within her means—in a word, practice voluntary poverty.
- ☐ Unblessed with Gandhi's long vision, generations of Indian leaders not only failed to heed his warning, they just did not know what he was talking about. Having consistently ignored his manifesto—although Gandhi continued to draw everyone's attention to it till his last breath—it was natural that we misperceived the target of his attack. In the rush, the meaning of his life and message became diluted and weak.
- ☐ Through *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi called upon India to reject modern civilization—nothing more nor less than this—and to return to her

proven ancient ways. A total cultural revolution—not just nibbling here and there—was what he wanted. Unsurprisingly, we gave him up for easier ways. The result—65 years after he wrote that prophetic book—is there for all to see!

- Can India yet return to the vision of Gandhi? Can she take an about-turn, unlearn her mistakes and make a fresh start? Can we all begin to lay the base on which Gandhi's dream of a civilisation may yet be built and man's wanton march towards self-destruction halted in good time?

## THE DEBATE

### *Sugata Dasgupta*

Orthodox Gandhians have two basic fallacies in their thoughts concerning Gandhi's prescription for social development. The first is that Gandhi had wanted everybody on this planet to accept a creed of renunciation; and that in order to reach his way—the gandhian way, so to say—one will have always 'to look back' and 'to return somewhere'. The truth is just the opposite. Gandhi had beckoned us not to the past but to a future society—a solid, rational system based on coexisting and coexistence. He had indeed enjoined us to look forward to it, rejecting in our stride the tempo-orientation of the so-called modern elite.

There is no question, therefore, of going back to Gandhi. One has instead to move forward to him and, with him, to a pattern of no return—no return to the present sufficing, modish social system. Neither did Gandhi call upon the hungry to give up their claims to a better standard of life. In fact, the 'minimums' of material goods that he had wanted everyone to consume have not yet been guaranteed to all people in any country of the world.

Although mainly concerned with Indian liberation, Gandhi's recipe was global in mould. I will explain what I mean.

The goal of all the countries of the world today, both of the developed and the non-developed world, is 'development'. Its connotation, 'norms', meaning and 'standards' are set by the so-called affluent communities of the world from time to time. High standards of living, accompanied by 'consumption baskets' constructed by big advertising concerns, provide the dynamic definition of this new phenomenon. Every nation, and every individual in a nation, has only one ambition today that is, to reach this goal anyhow and at any cost. Planners plan, politicians dream ideologies and social scientists supply formulae to help their respective clients to come as near the goal as possible. There is then



an all-abiding faith that the proof of human superiority lies in one's ability to reach this goal in the shortest possible time. Gandhi, despite the fact that he had no access to computers to arrive at any correct calculations, knew that the goal, viewed from the standpoint of the total resources available to mankind, was an illusory and unattainable one. 'Development' as we view it was therefore, to him, an oxymoron. Neither feasible nor desirable, 'development' to him was a new mirage: the modern man's most suicidal superstition.

The logic was simple. Development was not desirable because it was feasible only in a non-egalitarian, exploitative framework and not where principles of equity were practised. If everybody had a car, for example, nobody could use it. It was only when a few people had cars that the stem of 'development' had its function. This is true of refrigerators, televisions, air-conditioners, heating apparatuses and of all other items which go to make the basket of 'development'. For if everyone owns these perquisites, the gross national pollution—a product of these developmental gadgets—is sure to destroy everybody's lungs. If development is thus not desirable because it militates against the concepts of equity and is based on exploitation and status, as a universal phenomenon it is also an unattainable goal.

The logic here is based on arithmetic. If 'development', as described above, has been possible in the USA, it is because of the fact that six per cent of the world's population have been using 70 per cent of its resources. Is it not impossible, therefore, for the 70 per cent of the third world to 'develop' with the 10 per cent of resources now at their disposal? Assuming, theoretically, that the world's resources are equitably distributed and every one per cent of people could use 'one per cent' of resources, how could they attain 'development' as we understand it today? All that can happen in such circumstances is to ensure that poverty is removed and a fuller life than the one that the masses, say in the third world, live today is realized. The poor everywhere could only then reach the standard of life that Gandhi had wanted them to achieve. No more and no less. Aiming at a 'no poverty' and a 'no development' society, Gandhi's design provides the only rational and realistic goal.

The world has, however, yet to realize the logic of Gandhi's arithmetic. It has yet to realize that the task is not regional but global. The only way to pull up the standards of life of all people everywhere or some people anywhere is to pull down the artificial standards of living of a few, including those of the 20 per cent of people who are the affluent of the affluent society. For these few rich, Gandhi had certainly recommended the creed of self-abnegation, while he insisted that the rest must get the maximum benefit out of the total resources made available to all.

Gandhi's logic of development should be the criterion for the success of the third world. But so simple an arithmetic is often so difficult to grasp. The non-aligned conference at Algiers has recently provided sanctions to all nations to keep control over the resources they own today. Unwittingly, have they not endorsed thereby the right of the six per cent of Americans to keep to themselves the 70 per cent of the earth's resources that are under their control now?

The gandhian design for the new society is based on hard reasoning. It is difficult, however, for an uneducated elite, which thrives on the strength of guns, bank balances, slogans and voting powers and not on knowledge and wisdom, to comprehend it. But the reality is bound to dawn one day. As various countries proceed through one crisis after another and as Watergate, Solzhenitsyn, famine, food shortages, bloody coups and murderous inflation take their toll, the elite dream of 'development' will be shattered. The hot man will then accept himself, the masses will then throw their weight in favour of the new society. Through a no-poverty, no-development and less violent set-up, it will guarantee the good of all and help the weak to assert themselves in a bold new varévodya order. The present malaise afflicting all countries of the third world, including India, is due to the inability of the decision-making elite of these countries to understand the simple truth that 'development' is not—repeat not—a valuable goal. It is, on the other hand, a pernicious doctrine aimed at the systematic exploitation of the masses.

### *Denduff*

*Mid-Swara* was written six and a half decades ago. But it vividly reflects essential aspects of the conditions of India today. In fact, Gandhi's prophecies have come true and his prescriptions have considerable contemporary relevance.

### *Conditions of India*

To refer to some aspects of the exotic repository Indian polity—the culture of our people is indeed being poisoned by sensitive westerners and unreflecting industrialists.<sup>1</sup> The concept of economic man, the principal feature of which is 'high sensitivity and positive response to pleasure', or to affluence, has been accepted by the dominant elite in India as a social ideal, and is being sold to the people through powerful media of communication and large-scale politicisation.

Institutions, particularly in the ruling classes and the leadership, are getting relaxed. Moral decadence permeates the centres of power. The erosion of values is ungendered.<sup>2</sup>

1. *Mid-Swara*, 41: 91-95.

2. *Ibid.*

The quicker means of communication and persuasion are being used to corrupt the consciousness of our people. Gandhi was worried about the evils of railways.<sup>1</sup> But India today is exposed to many diverse media—radio, TV, films, paperbacks, periodicals, advertisements and publishing. These have accentuated the base nature of the Indian man. The anti-social elements can now fulfil their evil designs with greater facility. National unity, economic consolidation and inter-mental contacts and interaction between sub-cultures have no doubt been accelerated. But good works at a snail's pace. The new means of communication are growingly becoming disseminators of evil. They are the gilded indices of our prosperity.

Tyranny, hypocrisy, double-talk, double-think, open cut-throat, unwholesome competitiveness and unethical politics are rampant, the process is a rabel form having been inaugurated dramatically in 1969.<sup>2</sup>

Communal conflict and caste-antagonisms, of which the atrocities against Harijans is a painful feature, continue to disfigure the fair face of India.<sup>3</sup>

The English-speaking and the English-knowing people have completely enslaved India.<sup>4</sup> This is part of a larger process, the process of rapid diffusion of middle-class values and the enlargement of the middle classes.

When Gandhi attacked lawyers and doctors<sup>5</sup> (and all to his perceptions) he was perhaps taking them as representatives or forerunners of the rising middle classes and was warning at the dangers of the incipient process of embourgeoisement which, we now realise, is as inevitable a concomitant of industrialism as is urbanisation. India's political life, its pattern of production, its art and its social norms and its world-view have all been infected with embourgeoisement.

#### *Search for renewal*

Beyond giving a clue to the understanding of our problems, in *Myrd Swamy* Gandhi provides us with an approach, or the way we may handle our national and personal problems.

First, Gandhi wants us to recover our faith in our own civilisation. Not that he romanticised the ancient heritage of India, nor even that he was unaware of its defects. He simply wants India to stand in her own boots.

"India", he rightly says, "has nothing to learn from anybody else" so far as the basic philosophy of life and society is concerned and so

1 Ibid., 43-47.

2 Ibid., 59.

3 Ibid., 46-51.

4 Ibid., 51.

5 Ibid., 54-55.

6 Ibid., 44-53, 55. Gandhi was an isolationist. He did believe in keeping the doors and windows of our house open.

long as we are not swept off our feet by the life-passions of others.

From this, it can be inferred (and, I think, rightly) that Marxism, Liberalism, Freudism and Industrialism—great movements in their time and a precious heritage of human civilization—cannot deal with the ailments of the modern age, particularly those of India.

Gandhi's approach should impart self-confidence. He points out to some unfading sources of renewal within our culture, history and ethos. 'We cannot fight westernism on its own terms and on its own grounds', says Gandhi.<sup>14</sup> '... We must restore India to its genuine condition. . . . Although in our own civilisation there will naturally be progress, retrogression, reform, reaction, but one effort is required, and that is to drive out western civilisation. All else will follow.'

#### *Psyche of our people*

Further, *Myd Swamy* explains to some extent the psyche of our people in the matter of their response to injustice. Gandhi says:<sup>15</sup> 'Peasants have never been subdued by the sword, and they are not frightened by the use of it by others. That nation is great which meets its head on death as its pillow. . . . The fact is that, in India, the nation at large has generally used passive resistance in all departments of life. We refuse to cooperate with our rulers when they disgrace us. . . . I remember an instance when, in a small principality, the villagers were offended by some command issued by the prince. The farmer immediately began vacating the village. The prince became nervous, apologized to his subjects and withdrew his command. Many such instances can be found in India. Real Home Rule is possible only where passive resistance is the guiding force of the people.'

This knowledge of the mind of our people (as described in *Myd Swamy*) is relevant today.

Having watched how our people are passing through the curious nightmarish experience of economic crisis, it seems to me that there is little chance of the Marxian expectation coming to pass, namely, that deepening economic crises will ultimately on their own create revolutionary contradictions, that the exploited masses will become so aggressively assertive that they will bring about a revolution of a type not contemplated elsewhere.

It appears, under the prevailing circumstances, that a revolutionary upheaval is not on the agenda of a people who are leader-less, amorphous and unorganized. Therefore, their strategy for action against the present authoritarian, unjust, immoral order, based in favour of the organized middle classes and the vested interests, can only be based on (a) passive resistance and non-cooperation and (b) the creation of indepen-

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

dom control of power outside the formal framework of our polity, with a view to the seizure of political power by the people.

Gandhi related resistance to injustice and a movement for fundamental social change to the production of basic needs on the basis of a sustainable constructive program. This is *swaraj* and I think that it should serve as a hopeful alternative to the counter-productive process of sterile parliamentarism.

#### Gandhi's prescriptions

Finally, Gandhi's general prescription for the attainment of a new society may lack the glitz or sophistication and system of conventional analytical approaches. But it can be a basis for the fundamental transformation of our society. For example, the following specific points (implied or explicit) in *My Experiments with Truth* are worth considering while planning for a movement leading to the total transformation of our society.

(a) Discourage every process which enlarges the base of the middle class and promotes middle class values. For this purpose, abjure English, reject the present system of education, abandon the present laws and legal processes, devalue the importance of parasitical professionalism and commercialization.<sup>11</sup>

(b) Since industrialism is the mother of our sickness, its cross must be overcome. Under the present circumstances, we must resolve that as long as we cannot make even pens without machinery, so long will we do without them. In this context I do not agree that Gandhi rejects modern machinery in toto. He says: "I want to save time and labour for all. I want the concentration of wealth, not in the hands of a few, but in the hands of all. Today machinery helps a few to ride on the backs of millions."<sup>12</sup>

It is clear that Gandhi wants to neutralize the debauching, enervating and exploitative tendencies of machines. Consequently, the point implicitly made by the Editors, namely, the total rejection of modern technology, is not brought out in *My Experiments with Truth* as a whole. Gandhi clearly admits that while he rejects all machinery, some machines will remain. Perhaps, the Editors' point is valid in a limited sense if we concede that Gandhi rejected machinery in a metaphorical sense. For instance, he said that the body itself is the purest piece of mechanism, but if it is a hindrance to the highest flights of our soul, it has to be rejected.<sup>13</sup>

(c) In *My Experiments with Truth* Gandhi makes a plea for the gospel of love.<sup>14</sup>

11. Our writer has linked the whole modern system to the Spiritism. Its branches are represented by parasitical professions. *My Experiments with Truth*, 11.

12. *My Experiments with Truth*, 11.

13. *Ibid.*, 8.

14. *Ibid.*, 14.

and aims at replacing violence with self-sacrifice. He says that the central theme of *Hand Swear* is nonviolence and he interprets nonviolence as self-purification and more self-purification.<sup>28</sup>

I think this is essential today, particularly for the dominant leadership. India is slipping into anarchy under cover of individual freedom and rights. The collective inhibitions are loosening. This aspect of *Hand Swear* is specially relevant today. If we could create social pressures or generate collective or community sanctions against the leadership, either by noncooperation or by non-cooperation, it would be a step towards health and sanity.

(4) We should know that this is a time for repentance, expiation and mourning, and there can be no indulgence whilst we are still in a fallen state and we can become free only through suffering.

Obviously, *Hand Swear* as such is not a plea for the practice of voluntary poverty; of course, it can be so interpreted if we say that voluntary control of the use of modern machinery and living within our means signifies the voluntary acceptance of lower standards of living for the time being. Moreover, our rulers who have been saddled with power and affluence should practise voluntary poverty and abjure violence in every form. Our people are simply condemned to wallow in poverty for a long time to come.

In short, as explicitly made out, *Hand Swear* is a brief but comprehensive examination of the conditions of India, of what should be our approach to deal with our sickness and what specific and broad lines of action should be followed to build a new society.

#### *Prospects*

Finally can India return to the vision of Gandhi? I think, is uncertain, Gandhi's vision is practical and feasible. It is in tune with the compulsions of our age and its long-term problems. The consequences of the application of modern technology on a massive scale are forcing the people to accept the basis of Gandhi's vision, of which limited industrialisation is an essential component.

Several states in the USA are beginning to prefer slower development and a lower standard of affluence to excessive modern technology. Public opinion is swinging in favour of human and manageable scale of organisation.

Even in India, Goa has shown courage and a sense of realism. While there is a scramble among the other states for industrial projects, Goa has turned down the Centre's proposal for setting up a thermal power plant there. Not that Goa is not power hungry, but ecological considerations have weighed with the state in rejecting the lucrative proposition. Earlier, Goa had rejected the Centre's offer to loan a

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. 2.

large refinery and fertilizer complex on similar and ambitious grounds.

There is also a growing general awareness of the hazards of rapid and large-scale industrialization. One may therefore hope that given effort, education and a greater ecological consciousness, a more favourable climate will be created for the implementation of Gandhi's vision.

Moreover, except for limited urbanization, the periodic and unwholesome contact with corrupt politicians and the exposure of a cross-section of the people to radio etc., a majority of our people are still, in a sense, outside the contact in which a fraction of our populace—the rising middle classes, the vested interests and the nouveau riche—are fiercely engaged. The majority of our people still live in socially closed communities, untouched by administrators, policemen and politicians. They are outside the formal framework established by the ruling elite in India. Consequently the soil is virgin and the opportunities are large.

It is an over-simplification to say that modern technology is the root cause of our troubles. We cannot fix the responsibility on impersonal forces of westernization. The question is who fosters this technology. The question is who promotes westernization.

Our rulers, in implicit conspiracy with their counterparts in other countries, are against self-reliance, self-rule and self-definition. Themselves products of a set of bastardly forces, they are out to foist on the nation a bastard culture.

Hence the basic problem is how to deal with these usurpers—the anti-people forces.<sup>1</sup> And even for this *Mand Swayam* has an answer—non-cooperation and building centres of power outside the present institutional framework.

### *R. R. Dikshar*

I belong to the generation which has gone through the Swadeshi Movement of 1905-09, the Home Rule or Swarajya Movement of 1914-1920, and the Nonviolent Non-cooperation Movement of 1921-46. All these were instrumental in mass awakening and mass action and in bringing independence to India in 1947. Gandhi passed away in January 1948.

It is not true to say that India accepted Gandhi and his philosophy as a whole. Nor did the Congress organisation accept his philosophy of life. The Congress accepted his constructive program as a tool for mass contact for political purposes. It is well known that he wanted the Congress to convert itself into a Lok Sabha Sangh after independence. He laid down that the members of that Sangh should pledge themselves to work for the socio-economic changes he envisaged without directly entering the field of power politics. He dreamed that the Sangh should and would be so powerful as to influence politics without its members actually entering the field themselves.

All religious and spiritually-oriented leaders and sages from the beginning of history have dreamed like that and they have failed. It is no wonder if Gandhi too had failed in that respect. The politics of the struggle for freedom is always different from the power politics of a free country. While a struggle for freedom demands suffering, sacrifice and selflessness, power politics is oriented to an almost unscrupulous struggle to get power over men and things and retain it. The inordinate will to power and the love of power without the balancing will to serve others and humanity is the cause of today's individual, national, and world politics.

The earlier movements in slave India had prepared the ground for Gandhi. His greatest contribution is the philosophy of *satyagraha* (*satya* through nonviolence alone) and the technique of using it for solving problems in all human activities and affairs. It worked well during his life-time and deteriorated after his death in the hands of those who had neither the spiritual attitude nor the nonviolent approach, nor even the moral and ethical purity and selflessness that commanded respect. Today most of the *satyagrahas* are pressure tactics or follow the philosophy of strikes. Gandhi was accepted by patriots and politicians in India because they found in him one who could rouse and command the masses as no one else could. No one could dream of being his rival; and those who opposed him soon lost their foothold among the people as well as the leaders.

Gandhi had realized his historical role as a prophet. Towards the close of the struggle for freedom, when a few of us had gathered round him in his camp at Kingway in Delhi, I remember making the remark that most leaders of revolutions not only achieved the revolutions but also led the governments which came in their wake. He looked at me and said somewhat pensively, 'Main khata ho jaunga', I shall be finished! During the drafting of the Indian Constitution by the Constituent Assembly, I once asked him why he was not taking an interest in it. Gandhi said that if they asked him he would consent. We know how helpless he felt against the political tide that accepted partition though he was totally against it. His intuition was correct. He had said that partition would not solve any problems but would create new ones. That has happened and is happening even now.

Now as regards Gandhi's utter opposition to modern civilization based on science and technology and the multiplication of wants. Emerson wrote that man builds a house to live in, but he becomes a prisoner. He also wrote that man becomes all the stronger for every desire and temptation he conquers. Man is a toolmaker, but every tool makes him its slave, as he has to depend upon it.

There is an old Sanskrit saying: 'yat yat parasamatham dukkham, yat yat atmasamatham dukkham' (every dependence is a source of sorrow and



every self-reliance is a source of joy).

The soul of man depends upon its body-life-mind complex for its manifestation or expression. Liberation from this dependence, and realization that the self-conscious soul is, in essence, independent, is man's highest achievement in life. Similarly today's advanced science and technology are projections of the human psyche itself and have not come from afar or from outside. A total rejection is therefore neither possible nor advisable. Like body-life-mind of the human consciousness, they are a growth which owes its existence to an inner need for expression. What is necessary, however, is for man to remain the master and not to succumb to their overwhelming influence. Who is it that works in the scientific laboratory and the technological institute? It is the human psyche singly or collectively, secretly or openly. The human psyche is alive to the situation and Gandhi is a warning example. Since Buddha and Christ gave the same warning and failed to convince people at that time we need not be pessimistic about Gandhi's warning either. Humanity is yet in its infancy and it would see day master its instruments rather than rejecting them now. Rejecting them would mean rejection of man's own potentialities without trial. Making the instruments, trying them, using them without becoming their slaves is the way of the creator and of the hero. Rejecting them out of fear or apprehension betrays spiritual weakness.

Gandhi was never for total rejection. What he said was that we should invent, accept and use science and technology (which in themselves are amoral and neutral) without exploitation and without losing mastery over them. This alone can lead us to world affirmation. The other attitude leads us to world rejection and stagnation.

Gandhi was a prophet in the same line as Buddha and Christ. The virtues he preached and practiced were those of saints and sages. They require a total and fundamental conversion of the human psyche and can be attained only by a mutation of man's consciousness as envisaged by Sri Aurobindo. Till then the sadness has to go on.

Gandhi, the prophet that he was, played temporarily the part of a statesman, rather than that of a politician. He believed that it was only an independent India which could play an historical role in the world to come. He succeeded in that first part of the dream. As for spiritualizing politics which was his other dream, he could not make much headway with his followers. As for establishing a casteless and classless society in India, we are yet far off.

Gandhi's view about the use of science and technology were quite clear, he would use them only if they were consistent with human values and the spiritual betterment of man—not of a few, but of the whole of humanity.

In this respect man has begun to realize slowly the dangers of

going too far. Man is not a robot, a machine to be manipulated. He is an unfolding consciousness rising from simple animalism to divine heights, where satyam (truth), shivam (goodness) and sundarim (beauty) would reign supreme. Gandhi, therefore, warned us against everything which involved a concentration of power, whether economic, social, political, intellectual or even spiritual. Non-exploitation of man by man and decentralization of power of every kind are really the by-products of the arch of his extremely human philosophy; and they flow from the dictum, attainment of truth through nonviolence (love) alone.

### *Durga Das*

'Towards a Human Civilization' is how I would caption the subject. The reason is that the world has shrunk and it has become impossible to think in terms of nations.

The world has had three philosophies working on parallel lines. (1) simple living and high thinking, (2) high living and high thinking, (3) high living and simple thinking. The first is built on the concept of austerity, the second on affluence, and the third on technology reducing human beings to robots.

It is obvious that all these have to merge as the Ganga, Jamuna and Saraswati have merged at Triveni to make it for Hindus the most sacred spot for a bath or for performing their mortal ceremonies.

Gandhi's *Hand Swear* is based on eternal values. It has been ignored by his disciples and successors, for they were enamoured by the products of western civilization and political science. Vinoba became a Pope confined to his self-created Vaishya. Jayaprakash Narayan acted more like a political mendicant than a crusader. Other Gandhians inwardly felt a conflict between the gandhian and western values which paralysed their thinking and action.

The world has so far lived on the opiate provided by religion. Technology and science have destroyed man's blind faith in religion, but they cannot provide a substitute. It is for men and women to find another 'opiate', something which will stimulate aspiration and egg them on to fulfilment. That can be based only on a proper balance between his physical needs as ordained by modern conditions and his spiritual impulses. It can be done if the Aryans, Mongoloids and Negroes get together and formulate plans to pool the world's resources for economic regeneration, social well-being, and human fulfilment.

It is my belief that the compulsions of life—the need for survival and for security and stability—will find the answer by the end of the century. India has still the gift to provide the stimulus to such a movement—even on a world scale—provided that our power-corrupted leadership is replaced or transformed by gandhian values for the task of the

great crusade

### *Prabhakar Machwe*

Gandhi gave a fourteen-point constructive program. What have we done with it? The so-called Gandhians are the worst culprits as they have reduced it to a ritual.

Khadi is not self-sufficient, raw silk and fancy cottage industry products are foreign exchange earners of a sort. Prohibition is officially scrapped. Basic Education is denounced by its own previously ardent advocates. Harijan uplift has yielded no more egalitarian a society; on the contrary, the daily report of discrimination, molestation and lynching of untouchables is deafening. The cow is no more the centre of the village economy.

The growth of urbanisation and industrialisation in our country has been haphazard. All our priorities have been unfortunately ill-timed. Need we grow tobacco, opium and cash crops, when the basic food grains are not available in sufficient quantity? Do we need a cement factory or a coloured TV in every home first, while millions die of want and have cancer? Should our students waste their valuable time in ragging and rock music, in drugs and discothèques, or should they do voluntary service in the villages? Why should medical practitioners concentrate only in the metropolises? With so many thousands of unemployed engineers, need our food-control and road-construction be so elementary? Is it so necessary to import foreign films and literary literature, when our best publications don't sell? Are so many fancy delegations to foreign lands really necessary, when many of us have not seen our own land?

Nothing short of a voluntary peonit corps or a band of selfless workers, who will go from village to village in the spirit of silent, agitational, violent strikes for the dumb, suffering millions, can rescue us. These volunteers should be above all caste, community, creed, province and language prejudices. They should not be tied to any party or political platform.

There should be a total ban for the next five years on speech making, particularly by the professional politicians, all and sundry. We waste so much of our time, energy and money in this activity. Nothing comes of it but frustration and futility. One ounce of honest dedicated work is better than a ton of verbal display.

The most important change has to come in our social behaviour. How many of us inter-dine, inter-marry, encourage inter-caste friendship and harmony? There is no hope for a nation where the southerner hates the southerner and vice versa, where Bengalis and Assamese, Marathi and Mysoreans, Hindi-wallah and Urdu-wallah hate one another and do

not try to understand the irritations and appreciate the good points in others.

Charity begins at home. We ought to take up the program of cleaning our own premises, tidying up the surroundings and living more actively. Why can't we bring some sunshine to the dull, drab, dark routine? Can we not grow more flowers and fruit, tend some cattle and pigs, make one illiterate literate and so on?

Gandhi emphasized that physical labour ought to be respected and treated on a par with the so-called intellectual labour. Unfortunately, even after independence, the subtle caste system still plagues us. Technocrats and bureaucrats still rule over the dumb masses of workers and peasants. The disparity in their incomes continues to be unbridgeable. That is hardly the way to socialism.

There should be a thorough reform of our system of selection. We do not select the right person for the right job. Corruption has gone deep into our veins and what is happening is a travesty and mockery of justice. Let everyone have a free chance to compete and let each get what he merits according to his ability.

All this sounds pretty Utopian. But a beginning has to be made somewhere. People are losing faith in the so-called successors of Gandhi, because instead of becoming the instruments of a fundamental change in society they are just behaving like other imperial, disinterested spectators, or seated fiddlers to the *risala-quo-rala*. The situation has to change. Otherwise Gandhi's good name will be lost for ever—at the hands of the self-appointed Gandhians themselves.

### R. C. Majumdar

Mahatma Gandhi's view about the real nature of modern Indian civilisation as expressed in the booklet *Hind Swaraj*, published as far back as 1908, has been hitherto regarded as quaint and has produced but little effect upon the people for whom it was meant. The object of this symposium is to discuss whether, in view of the rapid deterioration in every sphere of our life which we witness today, the time has not come to give a trial to the remedy suggested by Gandhi and to respond to his call to reject modern civilisation in toto and return to the ways of life followed in India before the arrival of the British.

In order to judge the merit of any view or theory it is necessary, in the first instance, to examine the validity of the broad assumptions on which it is based. In Chapter VI of his booklet Gandhi says: 'Those who are intoxicated by modern civilisation are not likely to write against it. Their care will be to find out facts and arguments in support of it and thus they do unconsciously believing it to be true.' My first impression after reading *Hind Swaraj* was that Gandhi himself was a

great victim to this mental disease of intoxication in respect of the ancient civilisation of India. He has made a sweeping denunciation of almost everything modern and held out a very picture of almost everything that preceded it, without the least reference to the obvious merits of the former and defects of the latter. The dogmatic, unreasonable and unhistorical attitude has viciated almost all his conclusions and recommendations. I shall illustrate my allegations by a few examples. Gandhi has waxed eloquent over the miserable condition of the industrial workers. The picture drawn by him is highly exaggerated, so far as the present condition is concerned. But be that as it may, one may well ask whether the condition of the slaves in old times was not much worse. Certainly enough, Gandhi pleads, by way of extenuating the old civilisation, that 'formerly men were made slaves under physical compulsion, whereas the industrial workers are enslaved by temptation of money and of the luxuries that money can buy'. No humanitarian would possibly deny that miseries and sufferings imposed on an individual by physical force against his will or choice are a hundred times worse than a voluntary acceptance of the same by temptation. It is also very singular that Gandhi has not a word to say about the social slaves—the untouchables, the chandalas and others—the condition of whom may be regarded as the worst blot upon ancient Indian civilisation from which the modern age is free, at least theoretically and to a very large extent even practically. This is proved by Gandhi's campaign in favour of temple entry by the untouchables. If we think of the rules and regulations of the *Mama-Sanskrit* prescribing the conditions under which the untouchables and the chandalas, etc. had to live from birth to death, and the privileges enjoyed by the brahmins, merely by the accident of birth, as against other classes not so fortunate, we cannot look back upon the good old days without a sense of horror. When I remember that two thousand years had passed before the laws were remodelled in modern India, making everyone equal in the eyes of law, I for one would not like to go back to the ancient society, however blessed life might otherwise have been. I am sure women, who form half the population of India, would think three times before they would go back to the old days of the *Mama-Sanskrit* which lays down categorically that women at every stage in life, from birth to death, must remain subservient to a male and should never dream of leading an independent life. Gandhi has not a word to say of these evils of ancient Indian culture which he recommends to modern Indians, though he constantly harps on the good old days when men and women of all castes and classes were happy beyond imagination.

An extreme but typical example of the quaint ideas of Gandhi, which I am sure 99 per cent of the Indians would expect straightaway without a moment's thought, is furnished by his strong denunciation of lawyers, doctors and railways. These, we are told in Chapter IX, 'have

impoverished the country, so much so, that if we do not wake up in time we shall be ruined' He says that his 'firm opinion is that the lawyers have enslaved India'. It would be no much to the understanding to ask to prove that the lawyers played a very important, if not the most important, role in Indian politics in the 19th century which paved the way for the successful struggle for freedom against the British. But Gandhi has not a word to say about it in the course of his sweeping denunciation of the whole class of lawyers.

As regards the doctor Gandhi does not refer to the marvellous progress in surgery, unknown in ancient days, and the fact that the remedy for most of the intractable diseases like phthis, typhoid, small pox, cholera, kala-azar, malaria, etc. has been discovered in modern days. One would like to know how many Indians would entrust their cures to the practitioners of the Ayurveda and Unani systems if they could afford to call a modern doctor or send the patients to a hospital, which Gandhi describes as an 'institution for propagating sin'. According to Gandhi, 'it is beyond dispute that the railways propagate evil', and 'English education has enslaved us'. He ignores the fact that the railways and English education are the most important factors in bringing together the most diverse peoples of this vast sub-continent and creating the spirit of nationalism unknown before. It is hardly necessary to discuss his *Ignorance* that 'we were one nation before the British came to India. Subsequently they divided us'. His reference to the Muslim attitude towards the Hindus (Chapter X) violates every known fact of history.

The above views and statements, to which many others may be easily added, are so quaint and palpably absurd that any conclusion based on them cannot be taken seriously. But even apart from this, there is one vital objection to the proposal that the remedy for the misery from which the country has been suffering is to reject modern civilisation and go back to the old way. In view of the evils of the old way and the remarkable progress of modern civilisation in many ways, as pointed out above, it may be regarded as absolutely certain that with the probable exception of one per cent of the Indian population at the utmost, who have implicit faith in Gandhi, none can be induced by either threat or temptation to choose the old way of life and forsake the modern civilisation which he now enjoys.

The Editors are certainly right in their estimate of the extent of the present evils, and the urgent need of a remedy. But since the very basis of the remedy suggested by them is theoretically wrong and obviously impracticable, we must think of other means to ease the evils. In my opinion the evils are due, mainly if not solely, not so much to the defects in the present system of administration or the type of civilisation under which we live, as to the demoralisation of the men entrusted with

its proper working. The achievement of the independence of India was heralded by a program of nationalization as the basis of administration. How far it has succeeded in improving the economic condition of the country, for which it was primarily intent, is a matter of serious doubt and keen dispute, but there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that its chief result has been a complete all-round success only in the nationalization of manhood (including corruption), inefficiency and undisciplined, not only in all branches and departments of the Government, but in all institutions and among all classes and ranks of Indians today. The efforts of those who want to save the country from the depths of misery and degradation and impending ruin should be directed to the eradication of this evil. We should carry on a vigorous propaganda and campaign for the purity of life and high moral and spiritual ideals of which Gandhi was a shining example, rather than transplanting the out-moded ideas and sentiments which he had recorded in *My Experiments with Truth*. It is my firm belief that if at least fifty per cent of the Ministers and twenty-five per cent of the high officials are efficient, free from corruption, and inspired solely by the sense of duty and not self-aggrandizement, and similar changes similar reforms are effected in private institutions, India under the modern civilization would find its way to economic prosperity and moral and intellectual progress, and the necessary changes and adjustments between our ancient ideals and modern practices would automatically follow.

It may be argued that to bring about such a transformation is difficult, if not impossible! But certainly it is less difficult and far more practicable than the scheme of taking back the Indian society to the culture and civilization that flourished more than two thousand years ago, after discarding the modern civilization which has steadily developed during the last two hundred years.

So while I think that every right-thinking man should agree to the assessment of the present evils in India and appreciate the serious nature and the gravity of the problem posed by the Editors, I am unable to accept the remedy suggested by Gandhi in *My Experiments with Truth* and hence offer a counter-proposal. I merely suggest the outline for there is no use discussing details until the general approach is approved.

*D.R. Mahabhar*

This is a moment when our country is going through an intense moral crisis—a crisis of character and credibility. It stems from a jettisoning of the spiritual values so essential even for a materialistic modern state to survive and progress. This is indeed the sickness of the spirit we as a nation are suffering from. It is natural and right, therefore, that the nation should, on the rebound, turn for solace and refuge to the Father

of the Newton, whom it had deserted all these years.

Nevertheless, an equally relevant question to ask is—could a people and a leadership, found so woefully wanting in fulfilling the relatively modest goals of a conventional modern state, with all its panoply of the coercive governmental apparatus to back its writ, measure up to the rigorous requirements of a *Ramraj*—the nonviolent, cooperative, decentralised, democratic state of Gandhi's dreams? Such a state is to be based on the lofty concept of trusteeship, love and voluntary service where force is banished—'a moral society where humanist values would be fulfilled under God's rule'. Is this clay good enough to sculpt such a noble and magnificent structure?

Nor would it be practicable or wise to turn our backs on the modern scientific age. Without large-scale industrialization, can we really solve our colossal unemployment problem in a country where the population grows at the rate of 13 millions every year, granting that village industries are fully developed?

And how do we effectively attack the crying twin needs of agrarian reform and maximized food production, without modernizing agriculture and all that goes with it? Lifting above one want the forty per cent of the people now living below the subsistence level has to be the highest priority task before any Indian government.

After 1962 and the Indian debacle against China, and with a constant threat to the country's security from close and distant neighbours, it would be next to impossible to sell our people the idea of a state sans armed force and based on the Sermon-on-the-Mount principles.

Can we then arbitrarily pick and choose, like selecting weapons from an armoury, certain aspects of the gandhian socio-economic philosophy and reject others? I think this is both possible and advisable.

We refused to rely on nonviolence to defend our hard-won independence in this predatory world. Nor were we prepared to accept the gandhian theory of trusteeship in industrial relations. Nehru himself could not trust unchecked power and wealth to an individual and expect him to use them earnestly for the public good. 'Even Plato's philosopher-kings would hardly have borne this burden worthily', he commented. Independent India, however, professed to continue to adhere to the gandhian moral values.

Nevertheless, at the root of the sickness of the spirit is to be found the abandonment, on the part of our leadership, of their precious heritage and sheet-anchor of the gandhian ethic and values, in crass pursuit of cynical, opportunistic politics, where the propitiation of the bitch-goddess called Vote-Mafia became a public man's supreme political preoccupation. Thus the very fount of the country's politics is poisoned.

It is a travesty of democracy where politicians have to sacrifice principles for the sake of the vote and labour leaders vie with one another to



get for the workers more and more wages for less and less work, when they know that higher productivity is the only way for the country's economic malaise and that higher wages are illusory in the absence of greater production.

This cavalier attitude to the country's affairs on the part of the leaders is responsible for the prevailing shocking political dishonesty, double-speak, double standards and corruption of the soul that is today eating into the very vitals of the Indian polity. These are all symptoms of the sickness of the spirit the nation is suffering from.

If the grave damage done to the Indian polity is to be repaired, going back to the godman ethic and values in public and private life seems imperative. But such a transformation of Indian society is impossible without a wholesale change in the leadership and the introduction of an entirely new vintage.

Indeed, the quality of the leadership can make a world of difference to the character and strength of a nation. People are just so much putty in the hands of the leadership. Good leadership, like a good sculptor, can turn the wonderful plastic material into a beautiful and durable shape, even as a poor sculptor, like poor leadership, can make a complete mess of the clay in his hands.

We have before us the remarkable example of what good, effective leadership can do with human material. China, for long dubbed 'decadent' and 'a nation of coolies', under Mao's leadership almost overnight turned into a highly disciplined, proud, hard-working people, taking their place among the major nations of the world.

The credit for this miracle entirely goes to the Mao leadership's skill as well as single-minded dedication to the good of the people, the code-belay it expects in the eyes of its people; and above all, its readiness to enforce the rule of law and surely to put down anti-social elements whenever found, irrespective of personalities.

Guy Wint in his book, *Spectacle on China*, recalls the conditions in pre-1949 China in these words: 'It was not only poverty which made China decadent and explosive. It was the universal inhumanity and brutality...there was the horror of a decaying society, without firm government, in which jungle conditions prevailed, and the strong man, whether landlord, village boss, government or party official, army officer or bandit, preyed on the weak. The scale of corruption had increased in a monstrous way, and reform was very much needed.' If the present trends continue, that description of Chiang's China might soon apply to India.

I am convinced that a good leadership in our country could have easily moulded the Indian people into a great nation by eliminating their civic weaknesses, quickening their sense of public duty and social conscience and fostering social discipline in them — the three essential qual-

listens for the consensus of a modern state. In the last 26 years, all these three qualities have, far from growing, eroded among the Indian people. For that the blame has to be squarely laid at the door of the present leadership—I use the term in a broader sense, not confining it to any particular party but applying it to the entire genre of the prevailing Indian leadership.

In place of the current of the communist ideology, we have had the equally powerful legacy of the gandhian philosophy and ethic which would have served as a powerful bond to bind us into a disciplined nation, if only the leadership had not discarded it so thoughtlessly.

Therefore, anyone who undertakes the mission of curing the sickness of the spirit in this country must start with a radical change in the leadership of the country.

In 1928, Franklin Roosevelt fought and won the Presidential election in the USA on a solemn promise to clean up the Augean stables of the country's politics. And he sent a call to all good men and true. A band of intellectuals from the universities and the professions answered his call and rallied to him in the holy crusade.

In India a Jayaprakash Narayan or a Vinoba Bhave should lead a similar movement, and there are thousands in the country, old and young, particularly among the young, eagerly waiting to answer such an inspiring call from such a man, on a single promise of clean politics and an honest deal for the common man.

People will vote for them and voluntarily work for their victory. Such is the intensity of the people's hunger for a just and clean administration, honest leaders and a return to the rule of law. For they know that everything else will follow. Such a leadership alone can generate an entirely new atmosphere of right conduct and gandhian values. Then there is a chance of the sarvodaya ideals succeeding, at any rate, in village India.

*R. K. Puri*

There could be hardly two opinions about the progressively worsening malaise which has gripped India. High prices of essential articles, quite beyond the means of the majority, progressively rising unemployment, both rural and urban, striking corruption in all walks of social, economic and political life, and unattended urbanisation with its concomitant problems of slums, inadequate water supply, alienation and a tendency to violence, are its main indications. But are these so unexpected? In dealing with them, why try to hide behind philosophical expressions like 'the sickness of the spirit' or call for "desperate appliances" which question the very philosophy behind India's development effort?

If the remedy is to treat the disease let us be quite clear about the

origin. India has adopted the path of modern industrialization for its all-around development—and not that of *Mind Swayay*. It is doubtful, therefore, if even Gandhi, had he been living today, would have advocated it. As he stated himself: "I would warn the reader against thinking that I am today among at the vanguard described therein. I know that India is not for it. . . . But today my corporate activity is undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of parliamentary sway in accordance with the wishes of the people of India." So he wrote in 1921. He reaffirmed it in 1938 and would probably have said the same thing today. Even in his last will and testament, he wanted constructive workers to educate the voters through social service and other selfless activities. He clearly wanted India's development through parliamentary sway, i.e. decentralized democracy.

Every country following that path has, during its progress, come across these very problems. They met them face to face and overcame them by suitable action, involving no change in the set course. The remedies for our present ills must therefore be sought in similar action, for we are following the same path. It is very easy, in one sense, to suggest a change and ask for a return to "the vision of Gandhi"—call it by any other undeniably less popular expression, if you like. But to adopt it in the concrete would require another Gandhi, another leadership and perhaps another people. Even during his own lifetime, the Indian leadership and people rejected Gandhi's advice at least twice: once in 1941, when the Congress Working Committee offered cooperation in the war effort if responsible government was conceded, and again in 1947, when the division of the country was accepted. The same result would await him, were he to suggest it today.

For good or evil, India has decided to sink or swim with the rest of the world and to accept the current world picture about future progress and development through industrialization. Let us be clear that this picture is the same, whatever be the ideology adopted for development. In this respect there is no difference between the East and the West—democracy or totalitarianism. The world either refuses to be aware that the present industrial civilization is inexorably leading it to the brink of a doomed precipice, with its evils of pollution, exhaustion of natural resources, and moral and spiritual bankruptcy, or it foolishly believes that these could be tackled somehow. Anyway the attitude seems to be: "If we have to perish, let us all perish together."

The present ills are all familiar obstacles on the road and have to be tackled by purposeful action, high prices by their reduction or even, if necessary, by a reform of currency, rising unemployment by the creation of more jobs, sinking corruption, by laying down better standards of character all over, and unplanned urbanization by the better development of rural life and a regulated development of urban areas. All this

can be achieved, with higher standards of administration, character, economic planning and a stronger will. And the nation must adopt these remedies rather than try to seek refuge by suggesting a different course on an uncharted sea.

But let us not commit the mistake of assuming that Gandhi has no relevance today. He has relevance to the extent and manner in which his ideas can be applied to our current problems. Practising of voluntary poverty is one such idea. His constructive program has to be re-examined from this angle. The fight against caste and untouchability, the national language program, work amongst women, communal unity, Adivasi, leprosy work, and other items are all as relevant today as of old. But khadi, village industries, basic education, self-sufficiency and contraception must be reinterpreted in the modern context of the need for full employment and a better living standard.

But it was quite unnecessary for the nation to load itself with the burden of a colonial foreign debt and go about the world with a begging bowl, for money and grain. This could have been avoided without a change of course. Look at China. It has achieved a place in the company of nations through self-reliance, austerity and purposeful will and action. Let us not dismiss these achievements by ascribing them to confucian methods. Given the will and the leadership, they are all possible even in our democratic setting and context. The Bhoodan movement was a humble effort in this direction. But there is no limit to human effort and the capacity for improvement, and even to human suffering and the achievement of death, honesty and truthfully thought out and pushed through with will and determination.

Let us base ourselves on the terra firma of thought and action which we can comprehend as cause and effect. Certainly let us have as much of Gandhi's austerity, austerity, purity, strength of will and character as we can master. But today's need is to design and enforce the practical implications of these virtues in all walks of national life, including elections, education, administration, trade practices, social systems, political institutions and other related items. As a nation we have to introspect and question ourselves deeply and staunchly about the causes of the present malaise, and evolve remedies dictated by our reason and perception, but against the background of the ideas and ideals which Gandhi stood for and which he demonstrated in his active and purposeful life all these years.

*K. Rangachari*

For nearly a decade now, the Indian people have been passing through one crisis after another. The cumulative effect has been a loss of national morale and lack of confidence in their future. Today this pessimism

seems to have reached a new low. One can observe a deep, and often bitter, cynicism among those who have an awareness of social and political trends and can measure our performance against recognized standards of achievement. There is deep disillusionment among the poor and the illiterate who have been encouraged to cherish high expectations about their well-being in an independent India. Why should a people who had maintained a robust optimism during the vicissitudes of the freedom struggle feel differently now? The goals were then clear and the means to achieve them were not in doubt; the dedication of the leadership to the great cause was above question. The situation is in reverse today. There is confusion and perversion of means and ends, amidst the din of populist demagoguery the ordinary citizen is no longer clear about the purpose and direction of our national effort. He feels duped by the deceptive confidence tricks practiced on him by politicians at election time.

The disease is so well known that it requires no elaboration at length. There is a crisis of confidence which is eroding a still patient people's faith in the values of liberty and democracy, for the preservation of which no sacrifice seemed too great during the movement for freedom. Except the diehard reactionaries, no one can be happy about the present mood in the country. A rapidly increasing population, without a corresponding increase in the opportunities for work and the means of subsistence, co-exists with private opulence and ostentatious living; there has been a steady deterioration of all moral values and standards of public life and conduct. Why, how and when did the nation's chosen path go wrong? The responsibility of individual leaders who have been custodians of the national interest is perhaps very large. However, a more charitable view, which would exonerate individuals, would attribute the failure to the nation's deviation from the path illuminated by Gandhi, though we continue to pay hypocritical homage to him as the Father of the Nation. There has been a blind imitation of the ways of the advanced industrial countries for finding the means of economic salvation for the masses, without acquiring comparable efficiency in applying their methods or in overcoming difficulties. Gandhi knew his people and their limitations, he had the insight to foresee the inadequacy of the resources of the country to provide anything more than a simple way of living for all the inhabitants, on the assumption that the resources were equitably distributed. He therefore warned us not to set our sights so high in terms of the enjoyment of material goods—and a living style based on possessing a lot of them—as to rankle the inevitable disappointment. By history and tradition, India, he felt, was qualified to play a distinctive role in the world. But few prophets are honored in their own country and Gandhi's warning has gone unheeded during the quarter of a century of swayag. Not the good life for all but the acquisition

of power by the few over the many—by politicians, business men, civil servants, trade unionists, big landlords and top professionals—has become the objective of social and economic policies. The pursuit of wealth by any means, however unscrupulous, in order to achieve such power is coming to be recognized by the so-called elite as necessary and reasonable.

Can the nation now reverse its steps and go back to the path shown by Gandhi of accepting a life of voluntary poverty? Life for the masses who are already living in poverty would not involve any special hardship but, on the other hand, may bring benefits in terms of better conditions of living brought about by a better social order. The real difficulty would arise from the 'vested interests' in the existing social system. A Gandhian has to ensure that this resistance can be overcome by moral persuasion and a change of heart induced by non-violent satyagraha, if that should become necessary. Also there is no reason yet to abandon the hope that the democratic processes of the country will in the long run, if not in the short, help the emergence of a leadership which is less self-centred and sufficiently enlightened to recognize the need for giving a new direction to the national effort. However, a change either way cannot come about by mere wishful thinking. The Gandhians of India must urge and propagate the idea of simplicity (if not of asceticity) and the banishment of the cumbersome and often superfluous gadgets of modern civilization. There are, however, limits to what an open and free society can do; it will be un-Gandhian to force people to adopt a different way of life by the use of state power. But if the resources which the state can command, and those which can be induced, by policy methods, to serve its purposes, are devoted mainly to the provision of material goods for the physical and mental well being of the majority of the people in the villages which have been consistently neglected, and the leadership sets an example of simple living, the revolution will not be too difficult to make.

The revolution against the ugly aspects of modern industrialism has already manifested itself in the West while those who pay lip service to Gandhi still wallow in its illusory phantoms. The rapid and alarming degradation of the earth's resources, environmental pollution which threatens the safety and survival of human and animal life, the glaring inequalities among men and nations and the temptation for the rich and poor countries alike to spend vast sums of money on armaments (now amounting to nearly \$200 billion a year and increasing at an annual rate of 6 per cent) have all reached disturbing proportions. The more sensitive among the youth of the industrial countries have rebelled against the dehumanizing trends of modern industrial growth and registered their protest against wars and racial intolerance. Should the people of India re-exact the same western experience and tolerate the obnoxious aspects

of modern industrialism before rediscovering the message of Gandhi?

The root of the trouble in India is the highly centralized system of planning which is based on questionable premises. Despite the more recent verbal declarations about social justice and the achievement of minimum standards of living, plans are based on a continuing diversion of resources to gigantic projects in heavy industries and modern communications (like telephones, aviation and TV) while the needs of food and shelter of the growing population, and programs designed to remove illiteracy and disease and make life a little more decent in the villages, remains neglected. A beginning in the reform of our objectives and methods with a view to uplifting the downtrodden and the poor should be made at this planning stage. Perhaps the change may not come until the people, in whose name many crimes are now being committed, register their massive protest instead of handing out massive mandates for their own impoverishment.

This does not, however, answer the question whether the people will embrace voluntary poverty in the sense that Gandhi intended. In a philosophical sense perhaps, an ordinary person cannot really surrender a thing which he does not possess or does not hope to possess. Any self-denial has only be a kind of self-grasping in such circumstances. It is, therefore, inadvisable to take an extreme view of Gandhi's doctrine of voluntary poverty and interpret it literally. Not all the evils of the present day are the results of industrialism and human nature had exhibited its baser side even in the pre-technological age. There was nothing pretty about the squalid poverty, social inequality and vulnerability to disease of human beings in the earlier centuries. While deprecating the excesses committed in the name of technological advance, we cannot afford to ignore the positive side of modern communications which bring people together and make men realize the universality of basic human values.

There can, therefore, be no outright rejection of the progress in human civilization. Its content and character must be redefined from time to time and place to place. The capacity to invent and innovate is inherent in human nature, whether it is a blessing or a curse will depend on the ultimate use of this capacity. The pursuit of wealth is the pursuit of the instruments of human welfare, if the instrumentary complicate life without ennobling the mind, and the nation's resources are funnelled into an endlessly spending consumer economy which presupposes a distribution of income, then clearly the direction is wrong. As Emerson said, things are in the saddle and ride mankind. The means crowd out the ends and the so-called civilization reverts to barbarism on a different plane.

While Gandhi enunciated some of his doctrines in an extreme form, he was not given to dogmatism. He had the acumen to compromise

and comes to terms with realism. We can only guess how he would have reformulated his doctrine of voluntary poverty to make it a workable program in the current context. He once said: 'I do varanasi electricity, shipbuilding, iron works, machine making and the like existing side by side with village crafts. But the order of dependence will be reversed. Hitherto industrialization has been so planned as to destroy the village and village crafts. . . . Under my scheme, nothing will allowed to be produced by cities which can equally well be produced in the villages. The proper function of cities is to serve as a clearing house for village products.' There is no reason why we should not subscribe to this basic proposition.

Our politicians and policymakers have only talked about decentralized planning and some feeble beginnings have been made. But centralized planning still dominates the scene and a handful of planners sitting in Delhi decide the details of what should be done at the regional or district level. There are no credible schemes for utilizing the vast rural manpower in schemes to improve living conditions and provide community services, or for motivating the rural people to rely on their own concerted efforts for the many things for which they are now expected to look up to an unsympathetic and increasingly corrupt officialdom. The take-over by the state of many aspects of private activity, ostensibly in the name of socialism but in reality to extend the area of its patronage for political purposes, compels the citizens to look up to the state for everything. 'Swaraj will be a sorry affair,' said Gandhi, 'if people look up to it [the state] for the regulation of every detail of life.' Big government, big business, big trade unionism have all dwarfed the individual and destroyed his initiative. his role is confined to paying out the big money they want for their purposes in taxes, prices and other levies. Those who believe that Gandhi's message has relevance to our present condition (their numbers may be larger than we think) have to undertake a sustained campaign to educate the people about the moral decadence we have suffered and the alternatives that are still open to us to regain national self-respect and self-reliance in the true sense. A non-violent satyagraha may be necessary as the next step, elections based on adult suffrage should normally have rendered such a course unnecessary, but the shameful manner in which they are rigged and the people misled by money and propaganda has vitiated the democratic process. Satyagraha cannot, however, succeed unless the people are made aware of its objectives.

### *P. Kodanda Rao*

The main purpose of *Hind Swaraj* was the demand of home rule for India. It was therefore primarily political in aim. Gandhi regretted



that British rule had introduced the western and modern civilization into India to the detriment of her own ancient civilization which he claimed was superior. He therefore advocated the rejection of the western and modern civilization and the restoration of the ancient Indian civilization.

The working theme of the Symposium does not define precisely enough what constitutes the western and modern civilization and what constitutes the ancient Indian civilization. It recommends the practice of voluntary poverty, but does not define what poverty means. To enable a more purposeful discussion, these phrases should be defined as precisely as possible, otherwise the discussion will turn on vague generalities.

Truth and nonviolence are among the principles advocated by Gandhi, but they are as old as humanity itself. Even today in the law courts witnesses are under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. In fact, telling lies has been a crime! In practice, most people tell the truth most of the time, some depart from it practically all the time, and many do so on exceptional occasions when it is to their profit. The difference is between profession of truth and practice of it. Gandhi did not invent the ethical imperative, nor succeed in securing its universal practice. Everybody preaches it, but few are *Hierophantines* at any time in human history.

Nonviolence or ahimsa is also as old as humanity and pretty universal. Everybody is not at everybody's throat every day. Violence is a crime and is exceptional. Even as an ideal, Gandhi was not the creator of nonviolence. All religions and prophets have preached it. Gandhi also preached it and he practised it in his life perhaps more effectively than most others. But on occasions he evoked courage above ahimsa! He subordinated ahimsa to compassion when he approved of mercy-killing of animals suffering from incurable diseases, he subordinated ahimsa to patriotism when he recruited soldiers for the army during World War I. While he proposed to meet the Japanese invasion nonviolently, he approved of the Indian troops using force in Kashmir to repel the raiders in 1947. He even approved of euthanasia for human beings.

Gandhi believed in God, but his definition of God was not consistent. On some occasions he said that God was Truth and on others that Truth was God and on yet other occasions that God was Love. He explained his definition of Truth as God in order to accommodate an atheist like Charles Bradlaugh whom he admired as a good man!

In my opinion, the special contributions of Gandhi were not truth and nonviolence but ahimsa for the sake of others, as when he undertook a fast to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity or when he felt that all his instruments in his anti-untouchability campaign were not pure. But

some of his fasts were coercive measures as they were intended to compel others to do what they did not wish to do voluntarily and cheerfully; as, for instance, when he failed to coerce the Government of India, against its will, to hand over Rs. 50 crore to Pakistan. Gandhi did not, however, undertake a fast to coerce the British Government to yield sway to India or prevent the partition of India, though he had said that India could be partitioned only over his dead body. He did not undertake a fast against Jinnah to persuade or coerce him to give up his demand for the partition of India.

The concrete proposals contained in *Myed Swamy* were pronounced to be impracticable by several eminent authorities like Professor Seddy. Gandhi himself had said that India was not ripe for the kind of sway which he projected. That I fear is still the case. There is however one proposal of his which I venture to dissent from. He postulated that English was the language of the foreign British rulers and should therefore be eschewed by India under sway, and that she should adopt Hindi as the national language. I submit that no language is, or can be, either 'foreign' or 'Indian' since it can have no political nationality, British, Indian or other. No language has either a nationality or a race or a religion or a sex. Language is a universal inheritance. A professor who shares his knowledge of language with his pupils will not share his salary also with them. This is because language is a non-national cultural element which cannot be owned by anybody but which can be acquired by everybody, whereas salary or property is a material cultural element and can be owned by individuals or groups of individuals. This distinction between the material and non-material cultural elements is, in my humble opinion, of vital importance. If English were of British nationality or belonged to the British, then Gandhi would not have been able to use it nor Gandhi *Myed*.

In some quarters there is prejudice against English in the belief that it was imposed by the British rulers for their own convenience on Indians. But the fact is that no less a statesman and patriot than Raja Ram Mohan Ray invited the introduction of English into India to give Indians access to modern experimental science, and his plea was given official sanction by Lord William Bentinck, the Governor General and Lord Minto, his Law Minister. It was again the Raja who advocated that the official language of the Government of India should be English in the place of Persian.

Raja was Gandhi's apostle in several respects, including Hindi. When he was the Chief Minister of Madras he introduced Hindi in the educational system and made it compulsory, but by 1867 he changed and proclaimed that English should be the medium of higher education and higher administration throughout India and on a permanent basis. At the Convention on the place of English in the Indian educational

system, held in Madras in November 1967, Raju said: "My friend, Kottanda Rao, was the first to use that we should definitely and without any doubt say that we want English for ever. I thought that he was using too strong a phrase which would attract poison on the other side. On the face of a "for ever" looked quoted, so I hesitated to accept that slogan. Kottanda Rao persisted in spite of considerable feeling that he was going too strong. But he kept up without relaxing. Now we have come to his position."

Gandhi is a prophet to be worshipped like the Buddha, but most of his concrete policies do not seem to have universal relevance, or special relevance to India at any time.

### *Mohi Sen*

Who can deny that a sickening moral crisis pervades the upper and middle echelons of Indian society? Indeed, one of the more disgusting characteristics of this moral crisis is the enormous amount of broadcasting and the cries of *own culpa* that reverberate from these very echelons. They seem to forget that far from being the doctors they are themselves the disease.

A great deal of the weeping about the moral crisis in India is nothing but a smokescreen to hide the material causes and basis of this crisis. When millions starve but monopolists hoard foodgrains, we are confronted certainly with a moral crisis, but one that emanates from deeply material-social causes. And the remedy is not the preaching of morals to the hoarders and monopolists but drastic social surgery—the removal of those breeding grounds of a thoroughly immoral situation.

Many things have happened in India in the twenty-five years of our freedom about which we can be legitimately proud. There have been economic achievements which make our country better able to stand up to whatever winds may blow from the storm centres of imperialist intervention. Our people today have a better recognition of the international linkages of our struggle to complete our process of becoming Friendship with the Soviet Union is stronger today than ever before. We have not done enough by far but we have done something to aid the struggle of other peoples to be free. Hence we have an Bangla Desh as a neighbour and we have the friendship of the immortal and valiant people of Vietnam.

Where we have failed and failed quite abjectly is to complete the promise of our struggle for freedom. The accepted program of the national movement remains largely unimplemented. The radical prescriptions of a Gandhi or a Nehru serve as reminders, as beacons and not as directions of accomplishment. Many wars remain to be waged from many millions of eyes and *Durga Narayani* still starts out from the

random eyes of the Indian bird under the Indian sky.

At the same time, we have the reverse side of the medal. Some have gained from this failure, more particularly the gentry who claimed to live in the shadow of Gandhi. The landlords have not obliged by running away but have continued to murder and to burn those who were given the name of the children of God.

What has, however, happened as a result of the 25 years of contradictory development is that a stage has been reached when the equilibrium of the middle way, based on the mixed economy, the system of dreds and patches, has begun to give way. Equilibrium, even a moving one, is replaced by almost instantaneous oscillation. The masses are no longer willing to put up with a plastic plan economy not reconcile themselves to a situation where a lot is within sight but out of reach, as Mrs Indira Gandhi put it. More particularly, one would like to add, when what is in sight is grabbed by a few within the vision of the many.

What is one to say of a situation where the national income rises by less than one per cent, prices rise by over 20 per cent and registered unemployment jumps by 24 per cent—all in a single year and a year after the tremendous thrill of helping the liberation of 75 million people? What is one to say when the Finance Minister himself admits the existence of a parallel economy run on a black money stock of Rs 1,500 crore with an annual increment of Rs 1,400 crore? And to make one more aghast, the same Finance Minister refuses to take a single worthwhile remedial measure!

And where the monopolists and landlords set the pace, it is only natural that vast segments of what are called the middle-classes follow. This is the true process of sandalization as a prelude to vulgarization that shapes so much of social life in our country.

The remedy lies not in the preaching of morals but the proclamation of a program of struggle against an order that can no longer be needed but has to be ended. One can even go further and state that the program is there—indeed, it has been there since the thirties—but the call to struggle does not sound clearly and firmly enough. Let us remember that the greatest moral regeneration of modern India was accomplished when the call for courage and for sacrifice came from a man who became the greatest organizer of the anti-imperialist struggle of our millions. The pointing to the need for purification evoked response since it was inextricably linked with concrete programs for concrete struggles. And shall we forget that it was this very man of morals who urged his closest henchmen to launch another satyagraha in 1947? The man of morals also called himself the generalissimo of mass action. This was the way to cut the Gordian knot then. This is the way today.

*Radhakrishnan*

In much the same way as most people, even those professedly atheist, when in a real fix invoke God (I remember Dr. Radhakrishnan telling us that when he had asked a Soviet communist what she had done when first shot into space she had replied that she had prayed) we Indians call on Gandhi when things go desperately wrong with us. No one will dispute that the present state of affairs in our country, in both economic and moral terms, has reached one of its lowest points in our national history. I do not mean by this, history stretching back to the days of the Pandavas and the Thugs, but contemporary history. In matters such as these one must exercise some sense of proportion and restraint. Things are certainly bad in India at the moment, but to say that everything is down and out or has collapsed is, to use the Churchillian phrase, a terminological inexactitude, or, to be less parliamentary, *bliss*.

I cannot claim to be an expert in gandhian thought. But I do belong to the generation which grew up under the mantle of his teachings and was influenced by them. Personally also, I had more than the usual opportunity of meeting and talking to him, and even more of knowing people who were his intimates, and have tried to analyse him and follow his principles. That can be the only justification for my venturing to participate in this symposium, which sets out to examine the prevailing sickness of spirit that has afflicted our country, in the light of gandhian precepts and practices.

It has been said that Gandhi prescribed 'voluntary' renunciation as a method for meeting the challenge of modern technology and the material affluence that follows in its wake. His precepts and practices, it is said, have been rejected out of hand by his successors (presumably the principal person responsible for that being Jawaharlal Nehru), and that as a result, the nation is now being compelled to accept renunciation, a fate a hundred times worse than the former.

I am afraid that I cannot accept the theme. It is off the mark. In my opinion, it gives a wrong impression of Gandhi's whole philosophy. The basic thrust in that philosophy, it seems to me, lies in its advocacy of the ideal of self-sufficiency-self-sufficiency in spirit. Such self-sufficiency can only be attained in this world by a fully satisfied person: one who has no further desires to satisfy here below. In brief, one who has succeeded in divesting himself of all worldly desires. It should not however be overlooked that his urge to divest himself of worldly desires is itself a 'desire'. It may be a substitution of a lower desire by a higher one. None the less it is a desire and must be recognized as such. It is not so much a 'voluntary' renunciation as a sublimation. It can only come to a person who has created within himself the capacity to

establish communion with something outside or rather above this world; with the all-pervading creative spirit, whom some call God and others by other names. Such persons are rare. To the ordinary man they appear to belong to a different category of human beings. They are not of this world; they are saints.

Gandhi was too shrewd and down-to-earth a man as well as a saint-in that he has his uniqueness-with too close a finger on the pulse of ordinary human beings to be under any illusion that human beings as a whole are made of anything except flesh and blood with base acquisitive instincts. The latter indeed constitute the motive power of the whole human progressive process and will for survival. In fact, without 'acquisition' there can be no 'voluntary' or any other kind of renunciation.

Therefore, what Gandhi meant by 'voluntary' renunciation was not a complete turning of the face to the progress of technology and man's mastery over matter. He wanted man to use technology and material progress for its true purpose, namely, to enable man to live in this world in a manner that would help him to feel at peace with himself and his desires, both worldly and spiritual, and with other living beings and the environment. For this purpose there has to be a harmony between means and ends.

Looking on the Indian scene, he realised perhaps better than any of our subsequent political leaders, that the Indian masses could only secure a better life and find their true position in society if they were provided with the means to improve their own economic position. It could not be done by imposing on them a system of production of which they were not the masters, but only the slaves. Therefore, he was against the importation of foreign techniques of industrialisation and manufacture which turn the worker into nothing more than a slave, even if he is a well-fed one. On the other hand, he was anxious to provide the common man with the best possible tools to enable him to work with the maximum efficiency and thereby improve his material lot. The classic example of this was his attitude towards the charkha. Gandhi was anxious that the peasant should produce his own cloth with his own hands. This was not so much because he was against modern machinery, but because he knew that a peasant working modern machinery installed in a factory in the city would be totally deprived of that freedom and independence that he considered the most precious gift, indeed the indispensable quality that a free society should confer on its citizens. He was therefore against the establishment of giant modern industrial complexes in India. At the same time, he was extremely anxious that villagers should be provided with the best possible means for spinning yarn in their own villages during their spare time. Hence his interest in developing the most efficient type of charkha within the purchasing

power of the villagers. He wanted village production to rise, leading gradually to the establishment of small-scale village industries.

The fundamental mistake in Indian planning has been the imposition from above of imported techniques and industrial complexes on a basically rural society that is still largely illiterate. At best, the latter can only mimic the motions of operating them without in the least understanding their modes of operation, let alone mastering it. The machine is like a god that has to be propitiated, or rather like a demon that has to be appeased by human sacrifice. Such progress in industrialization has no real relevance to the development of the personality of the common man. It only enslaves him.

What Gandhi would have approved of however, even in such industrialization, would have been—if the Hindustan Machine Tools factory, for instance, had been set up to produce on a mass scale—not ultra-sophisticated machine tools that we can only use in Europe and America, or for setting up other similar industrial complexes in India, where again the workmen are reduced to the position of slaves, but the ordinary tools that the Indian peasant and worker requires for producing with greater ease and in greater abundance those goods that he and his family and his village need, and which he used to produce until he was sucked into the maelstrom of the big cities, and the slavery of working in a factory owned by either the State or other faceless owners.

In brief, what the Mahatma would have approved of would have been if our industrialization effort had been directed primarily towards improving the social and economic conditions of the common man, by concentrating mainly at least, only on providing our millions of carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers and other artisans, progressively with more and more highly developed tools, so that they could use them for their own benefit and of their neighbours, develop their own skills, find their own employment, and live as free men in their own habitat.

Instead of that we have concentrated almost exclusively on trying to enrich the state, completely ignoring the individuals who constitute that state, trying to make the nation powerful and prestigious, forgetting that no nation can become really powerful or prestigious if the bulk of its citizens live in economic misery or in bondage. Indirectly this was done through the agency of both the private and the public sector with disastrous effects on the distribution of national wealth and social equity. The blame for this was then put on the private sector though the public sector was equally, if not more, responsible for it. And now, the emphasis is on making the public sector the great slave-master to whom every worker and peasant must get himself bound in one way or the other, if he is to keep body and soul together. This has made the economic and social position worse, and if the trend is not reversed soon will completely destroy whatever still survives of our professed guardian

ideals. Economic power and patronage is getting concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, not spread out more evenly as is proclaimed. A whole tribe of politicians and bureaucrats is growing that is even more remote from the common man than the private entrepreneurs and owners of old. Corruption instead of being confined among the few is now spreading down the line of the hordes of public functionaries that have their fingers in the operation of public sector undertakings. They follow the example of their masters and masters at the top and insist on getting a slice of the cake almost before it is baked.

Neither 'voluntary' renunciation nor compulsory renaissance is called for but a concentration on satisfying the needs of the common man, our greatest potential source of wealth and social stability.

If the state, instead of trying to become the step-father and mother of us all, would only devote itself to providing us with the tools that we need to produce what we want we shall be able to work out our own destiny, without either enslaving each other or corrupting ourselves or others, and India will become a happier and more prosperous nation.

## WHO'S WHO

Sagare Dasgupta, Gandhian Institute of Studies, Banaras

Dendutt, Editor, *Point of View*, New Delhi

R. R. Dwivedi, Chairman, Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Durgadas, author of *India—From Curzon to Nehru and After*

Prabhuakar Mishra, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi

R. C. Majumdar, General Editor, *The History and Culture of the Indian People*.

D. R. Manchekar, author of *The Guilty Men of 1948*, etc

B. K. Paul, Sarvodaya Thinker, Nagpur.

K. Rangachari, Indian Institute of Public Opinion, New Delhi.

P. Kodanda Rao, Forum of International Affairs, Bangalore.

Mohi Sen, Communist Party of India

Badr-ed-din Tyabji, Former Indian Ambassador to Japan



# *School: the sacred cow*

IVAN JELICH

THIS IS A TIME OF CRISIS IN THE INSTITUTION of the school, a crisis which may mark the end of the 'age of schooling' in the western world. I speak of the 'age of schooling' in the sense in which we are accustomed to speak of the 'feudal age' or of the 'Christian era'. The 'age of schooling' began about two hundred years ago. Gradually the idea grew that schooling was a necessary means of becoming a useful member of society. It is the task of this generation to bury that myth.

Your own situation is paradoxical. At the end and as a result of your studies, you are enabled to see that the education your children deserve, and will demand, requires a revolution in the school system of which you are a product.

The graduation rite that we solemnly celebrate today confirms the prerogatives which Puerto Rican society, by means of a costly system of subsidised public schools, confers upon the sons and daughters of its most privileged citizens. You are part of the most privileged 10 per cent of your generation, part of that minuscule group which has completed university studies. Public investment in each of you is fifteen times the educational investment in an average member of the poorest 10 per cent of the population, who drops out of school before completing the fifth grade.

The certificate you receive today attests to the legitimacy of your competence. It is not available to the self-educated, to those who have acquired competence by means not officially recognised in Puerto Rico. The programs of the University of Puerto Rico are all duly accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The degree which the university today confers upon you implies that over last sixteen years or more your elders have obliged you to submit yourselves, voluntarily or unvoluntarily, to the discipline of this complex scholastic rite. You have in fact been daily attendants, five days a week,

nine months a year, within the sacred precinct of the school and have consumed such attendance year after year, usually without interruption. Governmental and industrial employers and the professional associations have good reasons to believe that you will not subvert the order to which you have faithfully submitted in the course of completing your 'rites of initiation'.

Much of your youth has been spent within the custody of the school. It is expected that you will now go forth to work, to guarantee to future generations the privileges conferred upon you.

Puerto Rico is the only society in the western hemisphere to devote 30 per cent of its governmental budget to education. It is one of six places in the world which devote between 6 and 7 per cent of their national income to education. The schools of Puerto Rico cost more and provide more employment than any other public sector. In no other social activity is so large a proportion of the total population of Puerto Rico involved.

A large number of people are observing this occasion on television. Its solemnity will, on the one hand, confirm their sense of educational inferiority, and on the other, cause their hopes, largely doomed to disappointment, of one day themselves receiving a university degree.

Puerto Rico has been schooled. I don't say educated but, rather, schooled. Puerto Ricans can no longer conceive of life without reference to the school. The desire for education has actually given way to the compulsion of schooling. Puerto Rico has adopted a new religion. Its doctrine is that education is a product of the school, a product which can be defined by numbers. There are the numbers which indicate how many years a student has spent under the tutelage of teachers, and others which represent the proportion of his correct answers in an examination. Upon receipt of a diploma the educational product acquires a market value. School attendance in itself thus guarantees admission to the membership of disciplined consumers of the technocracy—just as in past times church attendance guaranteed membership in the community of saints. From governor to *jibaro*, Puerto Rico now accepts the ideology of its teachers as it once accepted the theology of its priests. The school is now identified with education as the Church once was with religion.

Today's agencies of accreditation are replacements of the royal patronage formerly accorded the Church. Federal support of education now parallels yesterday's royal donations to the Church. The power of the diploma has grown so rapidly in Puerto Rico that the poor blame their misery on precisely the lack of that which seems to you, today's graduates, participation in society's privileges and powers.

Research shows that twice as many high-school graduates in Puerto Rico as in the United States want to pursue university studies; while the probability of graduating from college for the Puerto Rican high-school

graduate is much lower than it would be in the United States. This widening discrepancy between aspirations and resources can result only in a deepening frustration among the inhabitants of the island.

The later a Puerto Rican child drops out of school the more keenly does he feel his failure. Contrary to popular opinion, increasing emphasis on schooling has actually increased class conflict in Puerto Rico, and has also increased the sense of inferiority which Puerto Ricans suffer in relation to the United States.

Upon your generation falls the obligation of developing for Puerto Rico an educational process radically different from that of the present and independent of the examples of other societies. It is yours to question whether Puerto Rico really wants to transform itself unreservedly into a passive product of the teaching profession. It is yours to decide whether you will subject your children to a school that seeks its respectability in North American accreditation, its justification in the qualification of the labour force, and its function in permitting the children of the middle class to keep up with the Joneses of Westchester County, New York.

The real sacred cow in Puerto Rico is the school. Proponents of communalism, statehood and independence all take it for granted. Actually, none of these political alternatives can liberate a Puerto Rico which continues to put its primary faith in schooling. Thus, if this generation wants the true liberation of Puerto Rico, it will have to invent educational alternatives which put an end to the 'age of schooling'. This will be a difficult task. Schooling has developed a formidable folklore. The beguined academic professors whom we have witnessed today evoke the ancient procession of clerics and little angels on the day of Corpus Christi. The Church, holy, catholic, apostolic, is rivaled by the school, accredited, compulsory, unbreakable, universal. Alas Mater has replaced Mother Church. The power of the school to rescue the damned of the slum is as the power of the Church to save the Muslim Moor from hell. (Gehenna meant both slum and hell in Hebrew.) The difference between Church and school is mainly that the rites of the school have now become much more rigorous and onerous than were the rites of the Church in the worst days of the Spanish Inquisition.

The school has become the established Church of secular times. The modern school had its origins in the impulse towards universal schooling, which began two centuries ago as an attempt to incorporate everyone into the industrial state. In the industrial metropolis the school was the integrating institution. In the colonies the school inculcated the dominant classes with the values of the imperial power and confirmed in the masses their sense of inferiority to the schooled class. Neither the nation nor the industry of the post-cybernetic era can be

imagined without universal baptism into the school. The drop-out of the era corresponds to the lapid masonry of eleventh-century Spain.

We have, I hope, outlived the era of the industrial state. We shall not live long, in any case, if we do not replace the authoritarianism of national sovereignty, industrial anarchy and cultural narcissism—which are combined into a stew of leftovers by the schools. Only within these sacred precincts could such old porridge be served to young Puerto Ricans.

I hope that your grandchildren will live in an island where the majority give as little importance to attending class as is now given to attending the Mass. We are still far from that day and I hope that you will take the responsibility for bringing it to pass without fear of being damned as heretic, subversive or ungrateful creatures. It may comfort you to know that those who undertake the same responsibility in socialist lands will be similarly denounced.

Many controversies divide our Puerto Rican society. Natural resources are threatened by industrialization, the cultural heritage is adulterated by commercialization, dignity is subverted by publicity, imagination by the violence which characterizes the mass media. Each of these is a theme for extensive public debate. There are those who want less industry, less English and less Coca-Cola, and those who want more. All agree that Puerto Rico needs many more schools.

This is not to say that education is not discussed in Puerto Rico. Quite the contrary. It would be difficult to find another society whose political and industrial leaders are as concerned with education. They all want more education, directed towards the sector which they represent. Their controversies mainly serve, however, to strengthen public opinion in the scholastic ideology which reduces education to a combination of class-rooms, curricula, funds, examinations and grades.

I expect that by the end of this century, what we now call the school will be an historical relic, developed in the time of the railroad and the private automobile and discarded along with them. I feel sure that it will soon be evident that the school is as marginal to education as the witch doctor is to public health.

A divorce of education from schooling is, in my opinion, already on the way, speeded by three forces: the Third World, the ghettos and the universities. Among the nations of the Third World, schooling discriminates against the majority and disqualifies the self-educated. Many members of the 'black' ghettos see the schools as a 'whitening' agent. Promoting university students tell us that school hinders them and stands between them and reality. These are caricatures, no doubt, but the mythology of schooling makes it difficult to perceive the underlying realities.

The criticism that today's students are making of their teachers is

as fundamental as that which their grandfathers made of the clergy. The divorce of education from schooling has its model in the demythologizing of the church. We fight now, in the name of education, against a teaching profession which unwillingly constitutes an economic interest, as in times past the reformers fought against a clergy which was, often unwillingly, a part of the secular power elite. Participation in a 'production system', of no matter what kind, has always threatened the prophetic function of the Church as it now threatens the educational function of the school.

School protest has deeper causes than the protests evoked by its leaders. These, although frequently political, are expressed as demands for various reforms of the system. They would never have gained mass support, however, if students had not lost faith and respect in the institution which nurtured them. Student strikes reflect a profound situation widely shared among the younger generation: the situation that schooling has vulgarized education, that the school has become anti-educational and anti-social, as in other epochs the Church had become anti-Christian or heret had become atheism. This situation can, I believe, be explicitly and briefly formulated.

The protest of some students today is analogous to the dissidence of those charismatic leaders without whom the Church would never have been reformed: their prophecies led to martyrdoms, their theological insights led to their persecution as heretics, their saintly asceticism often led to the stake. The prophet is always accused of subversion, the theologian of irrelevance and the saint is written off as crazy.

The Church has always depended for its vitality upon the necessity of its bishops to the appeals of the faithful, who see the rigidity of the ritual as an obstacle to their faith. The churches, incapable of dialogue between their ruling clerics and their dissidents, have become museum pieces, and this could easily happen with the school system of today. It is easier for the university to attribute dissidence to ephemeral causes than to attribute the dissidence to a profound alienation of the students from the school. It is also easier for student leaders to operate with political slogans than to launch basic attacks upon sacred cows. The university that accepts the challenge of its dissident students and helps them to formulate in a rational and coherent manner the anxiety they feel because they are rejecting schooling exposes itself to the danger of being ridiculed for its supposed credulity. The student leader who tries to promote in his companions the consciousness of a profound aversion to their school (not to education itself) finds that he creates a level of anxiety which few of his followers care to face.

The university has to learn to distinguish between sterile criticism of scholastic authority and a call for the conversion of the school to the educational purposes for which it was founded, between destructive fury

and the demand for radically new forms of education—scarcely conceivable by minds formed in the scholastic tradition between, on the one hand, cynicism which seeks new benefits for the already privileged and, on the other, Socratic-sarcasm, which questions the educational efficacy of accepted forms of instruction in which the institution is investing its major resources. It is necessary, in other words, to distinguish between the alienated mob and profound protest based on rejection of the school as a symbol of the status quo.

In no other place in Latin America has investment in education, demand for education, and information about education, increased so rapidly as in Puerto Rico. There is no place, therefore, in which members of your generation could begin the search for a new style of public education so quickly as in Puerto Rico. It is up to you to get us back, recognizing that the generations which preceded you were misled in their efforts to achieve social equality by means of universal compulsory schooling.

In Puerto Rico three of every ten students drop out of school before finishing the sixth grade. This means that only one of every two children, from families with less than the median income, completes the elementary school. Thus half of all Puerto Rican parents are under a sad illusion if they believe that their children have more than an outside chance of entering the university.

Public funds for education go directly to the schools, without students having any control of them. The political justification for this practice is that it gives everyone equal access to the class-room. However, the high cost of this type of education, decided by educators trained largely outside Puerto Rico, makes a mockery of the concept of equal access. Public schools may benefit all of the workers but they benefit mainly the few students who reach the upper levels of the system. It is precisely our insistence on direct financing of the "free school" that causes the concentration of scarce resources on benefits for the children of the few.

I believe that every Puerto Rican has the right to receive an equal part of the educational budget. This is something very different from and much more concrete than the mere promise of a place in the school. I believe, for example, that a young thirteen-year-old who has had only four years of schooling has much more right to the remaining educational resources than students of the same age who have had eight years of schooling. The mere "disadvantaged" criterion is, the more he needs a guarantee of his right.

If in Puerto Rico it were decided to honour this right, then the free school would immediately have to be abandoned. The annual quota of each person of school age would obviously not support a year of schooling, at present costs. The insufficiency would, of course, be even

more domains if the total educational budget for all levels were divided among the population from six to twenty-five years of age, the period between kindergarten and graduate studies, to which all Puerto Ricans supposedly have free access.

These facts leave us three options: (a) leave the system as it is, at the cost of justice and conscience, (b) use the available funds exclusively to assure free schooling to children whose parents earn less than the median income, or (c) use the available public resources to offer to all the education that an equal share of these resources could assure to each. The better-off could, of course, supplement this amount and might continue to offer their children the doubtful privilege of participating in the process which you are completing today. The poor would certainly use their share to acquire an education more efficiently and at lower cost.

The same choices apply, a fortiori, to other parts of Latin America where frequently not more than twenty dollars a year in public funds would be available for each child if the 20 per cent of tax receipts now demanded for education were distributed equally to all children who should be in school under existing laws. This amount could never pay for a year of conventional schooling. It would however be enough to provide a good many children and adults with one month of intensive education year after year. It would also be enough to finance the distribution of educational games leading to skills with numbers, letters and logical symbols. And to sponsor successive periods of intensive apprenticeship. In northeast Brazil, Paulo Freire (who was forced to leave the country) showed us that with a single investment of this amount he was able to educate 25 per cent of an illiterate population to the point where they could do functional reading. But this, as he made clear, was only possible when his literacy program could focus on the key words that are politically controversial within a community.

My suggestions may mortally annoy. But it is from the great post-vaits and liberals that we inherited the principle of using public funds for the administration of schools directed by postsecondary educators, just as, previously, riches had been given to the Church to be administered by priests. It remains for you to fight the first public school in the name of true equality of educational opportunity. I admire the courage of those of you who are willing to enter this fight.

Youth want educational institutions that provide them with education. They neither want nor need to be mothered, to be controlled or to be indoctrinated. It is difficult, obviously, to get an education from a school that refuses to educate without requiring that its students submit simultaneously to custodial care, sterile competition and indoctrination. It is difficult, obviously, to finance a teacher who is at the same time regarded as guardian, umpire, counselor and curriculum manager. It is

unconscionable to combine these functions in one institution. It is precisely the fusion of these four functions, frequently antithetical, which raises the cost of education acquired in school. This is also the source of our chronic shortage of educational resources. It is up to you to create institutions that offer education to all at a cost within the means of public resources.

Only when Puerto Rico has psychologically outgrown the school will it be able to finance education for all, and only then will truly efficient, non-scholastic forms of education have been designed as provisional means of compensating for the failure of the schools. In order to create new forms of education, we will have to demonstrate alternatives to the school that offer preferable options to students, teachers and taxpayers.

There is no intrinsic reason why the education that schools are now failing to provide could not be acquired more successfully in the setting of the family, of work and communal activity, in new kinds of libraries and other centers that would provide the means of learning. But the institutional forms that education will take in tomorrow's society cannot be clearly visualized. Neither could any of the great reformers anticipate concretely the institutional styles that would result from their reforms. The fear that new institutions will be imperfect, in their turn, does not justify our servile acceptance of present ones.

This plea to imagine a Puerto Rico without schools must, for many of you, come as a surprise. It is precisely for surprise that true education prepares us. The purpose of public education should be no less fundamental than the purpose of the Church, although the purpose of the latter is more explicit. The basic purpose of public education should be to create a situation in which society obliges each individual to take stock of himself and his poverty. Education implies the growth of an independent sense of life and a relatedness which go hand in hand with increased needs to, and use of, resources stored in the human community. The educational institution provides the locus for this process. This presupposes a place within the society in which each of us is awakened by surprise, a place of encounter in which others surprise me with their liberty and make me aware of my own. The university itself, if it is to be worthy of its traditions, must be an institution whose purposes are identified with the sources of liberty, whose autonomy is based on public confidence in the use of that liberty.

My friends, it is your task to surprise yourselves, and us, with the education you succeed in receiving for your children. Our hope of salvation lies in our being surprised by the others. Let us learn always to receive further surprises. I decided long ago to hope for surprises until the final act of my life—that is to say, in death itself.



# *A gandhian perspective of social change in India since independence*

T. K. M. UNNITHAN

A REVOLUTION is considered "a movement-of demand that succeeds in obtaining power". If so, a bloody revolution need not be a revolution, whereas a nonviolent social movement can be a revolution. Using this criterion the Indian national movement led by Gandhi was indeed revolutionary in character, as it resulted in taking the reins of power from the colonial rulers. Yet the purpose of a revolution is lost if there is only a transfer of power between groups at the top. Only the broader objectives of attainment of power can make the definition significant. The possession of power and its utilization in specific ways, more particularly by a minority group, can sow the seeds of dissent among the masses, which ultimately may result in the overthrow of those in power. For a revolution to be beneficial to the people in general, social change has to be the necessary and natural corollary of such a transfer. Mere attainment of power represents only one phase of a revolution; the positive changes generated by that power alone are indicators of the other phases of the revolution. Gandhi wrote as early as in 1931: "To use political power is not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their conditions in every department of life. Political power means the capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If then I want political power it is for the sake of the reforms for which the Congress stands. . . . If we were to analyse the activities of the Congress during the past twelve years we would discover that the capacity of the Congress to take political power has increased in exact proportion to its ability to achieve success in the constructive effort. That is to me the substance of power."<sup>1</sup> Thus, for Gandhi, the attainment of full political power, *swaraj*, self-government, and sovereignty, meant the possibility of a complete reconstruction of Indian society. Has Indian society been thus completely reorganized and reconstructed in these twenty-five years since independence? If not, how much of

social change has been actively brought about and how does it stand in relation to the complete transformation of Indian society into the non-violent social order envisaged by Gandhi?

Very few would claim that Indian society stands transformed considerably since independence. It is perhaps true that in a mere quarter of a century only a miracle could have radically changed a tradition-bound society built up over thousands of years. Still, certain changes have taken place and these cannot be ignored. They may be distinguished as natural or induced changes, both of which could be either strategic or peripheral. By natural change we mean change which would have taken place anyhow, due to the impact of world forces, induced or planned change is that which is stimulated through the introduction of ourselves and which may result in certain intended consequences. Those changes which occur as unintended consequences of independent factors will also constitute a part of natural change. Some natural and induced changes are unimportant and inconsequential to the social structure and hence are only peripheral in nature. On the other hand, certain changes, induced or natural, can be of strategic importance in bringing about further changes in the social system. All these types of change have taken place in Indian society since independence. Changes in the economic infrastructure or in the political and social structures are natural. Among these can be counted changes in labour-management relations, agrarian relations, growth of opposition parties, changes in familial, caste and religious institutions etc. We may take it for granted that some of these changes would have taken place anyhow, because of increased urbanization and industrialization, which are universal trends. Yet these changes were speeded up by planned economic measures to augment industrial output, abolition of feudalism and hereditary rights and privileges, the redistribution of wealth on a more egalitarian basis, the promotion of democratic institutions, and the enactment and enforcement of laws to accelerate these processes. These changes are undoubtedly also strategic in the sense that further social changes are possible because of these. Similarly, in the social realm, changes that have taken place in the institutions of family and marriage, caste or religion are only peripheral. Yet some states like Madras are promoting inter-caste marriages and in Kerala the priesthood has been thrown open to Harijans. These are strategic changes and measures which are likely to bring about a radical reconstruction of Indian society.

The extent of the changes that have taken place in Indian society can be analysed with the help of three types of theories of social change, namely, the structural-functional theories, the evolutionary theories and the dialectical and conflict theories. The structural-functional approach envisages the social structure as systems of roles, as relationships that emerge through the interaction of individuals. The social structure is

seen as a function of recurring institutionalized roles. This would not only imply a system of expected norms and obligations and an integral pattern, but also allow non-institutionalized individual variables which constitute the potentiality of change. The evolutionary theory of change lays down that: 'all processes of social change necessarily give rise to changes in overall institutional systems; that all systematic changes that alter the scope of differentiation within the major sphere of a society necessarily result in the institutionalization of a new, more differentiated social order, better adapted to a wider and more variegated environment (of course, under certain circumstances, differentiation may also lead to regression, stagnation, attempts to differentiate or breakdown), and that the institutionalization of structural differentiation would be uniform irrespective of the differences in the concrete expressions of social structure.'<sup>1</sup>

The dialectical theories envisage the structure of society as a dynamic system of relationships. The components of social structure are not regarded as categories of stratum, i.e. status, position etc., which have a static constitution, but of oppositional groups, i.e. classes and groups which do not assume a state of system-integration as formulated in functional sociology, but a state of perpetual conflict. Social change is interpreted and analysed through the successive replacement and dominance of these conflict groups through revolutions. Revolutions and crises constitute the essential mechanics of social change. Most of the studies of social change in India have been evolutionary or structural-functional. In this study it is intended to use a dialectical frame of reference, we shall view society as a system of power configuration.

Power is defined by Ogburn<sup>2</sup> as 'the ability to affect social activities; it is not a thing possessed by social actors but rather a dynamic phenomenon that occurs in all areas of social life'. According to Hawley<sup>3</sup> 'every social act is an exercise of power, every social relationship is a power equation and every social group or system is an organization of power. Accordingly it is possible to transmute any system of social relationships in terms of potential or active power'. Perhaps such a transposition is nothing more than the substitution of one terminology for another.<sup>4</sup> Though we agree with Ogburn's definition that power is a dynamic phenomenon occurring in all areas of social life and not a thing possessed by the actors, possession of certain assets and qualities by the actors makes it possible to predict a pattern of operation of power situations. For example, A's possession of much material wealth in itself is not power, but in a certain situation one can predict that power would generate from A on account of his command over a scarce resource, wealth. Similarly B's religious knowledge in itself is not power, but his capacity to generate power in certain situations depends upon his demonstrated charisma. We should, therefore, examine in this context

not only the actual situations which determine power generation, but also the factors that promote power configurations. Social changes would correspond to changes in the power configurations.

For classification and study of Indian society we can use a tri-sector model: elite, folk and tribal.<sup>2</sup> The elite are the few leaders and decision-makers who are capable of considerably affecting social activities. The folk, that is the rural and urban middle class which constitutes the bulk of the population and contributes substantially to the maintenance of society, are controlled and regulated in their activities by the decisions of the elite. The tribal sector, constituted by the Adivasis, untouchables and other similar minorities and backward groups, though an integral part of the general society, has nevertheless been kept as a separate cultural entity in many respects. This is not entirely due to its own isolation, but largely to the inhibitions of the rest of society.

Who were the elites in pre-independence India? Who are the elites now? What are the differences in the character of the Indian folk since independence? What is the contemporary situation in regard to the tribal sector of Indian society? Answers to these questions will take us a long way towards understanding social changes in India.

Before independence the elites and the decision-makers were, politically and administratively, the British rulers and their henchmen, economically, the capitalists and feudal lords, and socially, the upper castes. Between them they controlled Indian society. Their interests did not lie in effecting changes, but rather in avoiding them and in maintaining the status quo.<sup>3</sup> Any alteration meant loss of privileges. All policies were so designed as to enable the continuation of vested interests and privileges.<sup>4</sup> This structure was supported and maintained by a powerful army and a militant police force. Any individual or group attempting a reformation was severely dealt with. Efforts were not spared to suppress any mass movement that developed. Moreover, suppression of the Indian masses was easy in view of the 'fatalistic other-worldliness' which existed in the minds of the Hindus who were resigned to accept a static frame of social organisation. Generations of religious teachings had conditioned them to accept a hierarchical, compartmentalised social order based on inequality as a natural situation, the questioning of which could be done only at the cost of violating religious norms. The Hindu religious values, like the doctrine of karma, had reinforced these beliefs and provided a basis for individual satisfaction in conforming to social practices rather than questioning them. Such conditioned people could hardly be expected to initiate changes.

The tribal sector was kept outside the mainstream of Indian society. They were denied even the privileges religiously allowed to those (shudras) who were traditionally expected to do service. They were used as slaves, primarily to increase agricultural output. By paying only

subordinate wages the privileged class used the surplus for their luxuries. Not only were they economically exploited, but they were socially and psychologically suppressed and most of them were treated as outcasts and untouchables. There was no place for them in the power structure. Such was the situation before independence.

After India attained freedom the class structure has undergone a change. With the replacement of the colonial government by self-government and introduction of democratic institutions, political elites began to dominate the class structure. The power of feudal lords and caste/rule rulers began to fade. As private capital was allowed to flourish in spite of the state policy of socialism, it assumed a major role in shoring power balances. Political, business and military interests constituted the real power elites in this country. Though, theoretically, the folk or the masses gave support to the political elites, in actuality the masses did not have any controlling role over them. The power elites were able to so manipulate the masses that the latter became witnesses to their own helplessness. Once they made use of the masses through the democratic institutions, the elites became masters of the situation and began to exercise considerable power and decisively affect social activities.

At the same time the folk structure of society also underwent a transformation. With the liberation of the common man from the clutches of a rigid, stratified social system by abolition of feudalism and hereditary rights, horizontal and vertical mobility became a possibility. Once the ideal of a socialist society had been accepted it became possible to introduce a number of egalitarian measures. Through introduction of adult franchise, democratic decentralisation through Panchayati Raj, and greater possibilities of education, the rural and urban leadership changed hands. The place of hereditary and traditional leaders was taken up by a new generation of leaders who possessed a different set of attitudes and values in contrast to their earlier counterparts. If this new generation can assert itself strongly, it will be able to considerably alter not only the folk structure but also that of the elite, unless, of course, it associates itself with the elites and dissociates itself from the masses, as the current trend indicates.

There has been much less change in the position of the tribal sector. However, the reports that come from many villages regarding conflicts between Harijans and upper caste Hindus are symptomatic of change. Violent clashes are reported from many villages in Rajasthan, as well as from other parts of India. These clashes centre upon the refusal of Harijans to carry out their traditional occupations, like removing dead animals, etc. Before independence such a conflict could hardly occur. In the first place the Harijans would not have questioned their subjugation. They had for generations been made to believe that their plight

was God-ordained, religiously sanctioned and based on the doctrine of karma. Any questioning of it would have been an act against God himself which would have been punishable by God and man alike. Secondly, the upper caste Hindus were so well entrenched in their social privileges, fortified by religious and social sanctions, that any such revolt would have been crushed violently. Now after a quarter of a century of independence the situation is different. The poor and the down-trodden masses of India, who were considered social outcasts, have been given the right to think for themselves and to aspire to the society which hitherto was denied to them. The Indian Constitution and the various governmental measures have made it possible for them to aspire to social positions on the basis of their achievements. Due to the educational and economic opportunities given to the backward classes a new generation is rising. It is this new generation that is at the back of the rural social conflicts. Since the law and the state are on their side, eventually the depressed castes are bound to succeed, even though the upper castes may try to suppress the results. The traditional occupational pattern of villages will be broken and the village social structure will be based on more and more egalitarian norms, in spite of the overt and covert practices of untouchability and other acts of social ostracism that we continue to witness throughout the country. This is symptomatic of a power struggle that is going on. Inter-caste marriages, provision for Harijans, economic and educational measures to improve their material conditions, along with compelling the rest of society to accept these down-trodden people as equal, may eventually result in a radical alteration of the social structure. When this happens the tribal and folk sectors will merge. But such a possibility is far off. What we witness today are just some cracks in the boundary walls that separate the tribes from the rest of society.

Changes in the practice of untouchability, in the caste structure and status of women, the abolition of special privileges and monopolies, the introduction of democratic institutions are all in the direction of a gandhian social order and may be called positive changes. But the gandhian concept of change is essentially voluntaristic and his ideas centre upon the acceptance of dharma as an end as well as a means in all individual and social actions; acceptance of egalitarian values in social, economic and political institutions, in spite of contrary religious-cultural sanctions, simultaneously repudiating all inequalities; belief in God along with the tolerance of different religious faiths; continuous reformation of the individual in terms of the values of non-violence, truth and selfless action in pursuit of truth and non-violence, with a capacity to identify one's own well-being and happiness with those of the entire society. This implies individual reformation and character formation. The surrender of individual interests, for the sake of society, is a necessary

condition for a non-violent social order. Increasing information of individuals in terms of altruistic values is bound to result in social changes which are qualitatively different. If more and more altruistically oriented individuals come to exist, then there will be a change in power configurations also. The change in the power structure will take place not because of state action, but because of voluntary surrender of power. Political leaders and statesmen will renounce positions of authority and prefer social service, like Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan. There will be more and more trustees in the gandhian sense, and less concentration of economic power. There will be more and more Jevandhan, Gramdhan and Bhoodhan. That we witness the opposite trend in society at present shows how far we are from gandhian ideals. The attribute of a qualitatively higher change is its relative permanence. The changes that have occurred are not because of any transformation of society in the direction of altruism, but because of the coercive measures of the state. These changes are not only relatively less permanent, but they are also incapable of producing the larger changes which will take the social order to higher levels of existence. Mayakalis, bloodshed and violence continue to take place, the inculcation of higher values, their precept and practice, seems to be receding, and Gandhi's goal of a classless and stateless society still remains a dream!

1. V. V. Ramana Murti: *Gandhi: Essential Writings*, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1970, p. 133.

2. S. M. Barnett: 'Social Change, Differentiation and Evolution', *American Sociological Review*, June 1964, Vol. 29, No. 3, p. 313.

3. Marvin E. Olsen: *Power in Society*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1970, p. 3.

4. Anna H. Hawley: 'Community Power and Urban Renewal Success', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 68, January 1963, pp. 423-36.

5. T. K. N. Unnithan, Yogendra Singh and Indira Devi, *Towards a Sociology of Culture in India*, Prentice Hall, New Delhi, 1966, Part I.

6. Gunnar Myrdal: *The Challenge of World Poverty*, Penguin International Edition, 1970, p. 15.

7. Gunnar Myrdal: *Asian Drama*, Edition 1970, p. 51, Farrar, New York, 1968 (revised edition).

8. T. K. N. Unnithan: *Gandhi and Free India*, J. B. Wolcott, Groningen, 1935 (revised version).

# *Experiments in trusteeship management*

K. D. TRIPATHI

INDIA IS IN A PROCESS OF 'SOCIO-ECONOMIC REVOLUTION', implying a drastic change in the major social, economic and political institutions, the system of property relations, the forms of production, the legal structure, the type of political organisation and social beliefs or ideologies. The existing capitalist or bourgeois institutions exhibiting certain social beliefs or ideologies are faced with a serious challenge from alternative economic systems. In the wake of rising discontent and the explosion of aspirations and expectations amongst the masses, India has to decide (a) whether its existing system of economic organisation can adapt itself to the changing needs of an egalitarian society through nonviolent means or (b) alternatively, whether it is prepared to accept the Marxist, Fascist or Maoist totalitarian philosophies.

## *Gandhi's trusteeship*

Gandhi advocated the nonviolent transformation of a feudal or capitalist order into an egalitarian one through acceptance of the principle of trusteeship by all owners of property, whether material or human, whether land or capital or talent. Following the Gita concepts of *samgraha* (non-possession) and *samabhava* (equality) and Socrates' principles of equity, Gandhi wanted to prove his trusteeship concept in the realm of economic relations and business management. 'All life is a trust and all power carries with it obligations.'<sup>1</sup> His principle of trusteeship expresses the inherent responsibility of business enterprise to its consumers, workers, shareholders and the community, and their mutual responsibilities to one another.

The basic tenets of his simple, practical trusteeship formula<sup>2</sup> (as drafted by Prof. M.L. Dantwala and corrected and finalised by Gandhi) are given below.

- (1) Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capi-



latent order of society into an egalitarian one. It gives no quarter to capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.

(2) It does not recognise any right of private ownership of property, except in so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.

(3) It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.

(4) Thus in the state-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interests of society.

(5) Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum and maximum incomes should be reasonable and equitable, and variable from time to time, so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference.

(6) Under the gandhian economic order, the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed.

Gandhi viewed industry as a 'social franchise', a social partnership and a joint enterprise of labour and capital in which both owners and workers were co-trustees of society. Gandhi's whole life was dedicated to establishing a new socio-economic order, based on the principles of non-violence, truth and justice. His precepts of self-sacrifice, devotion to societal aims and application of ethical values to economic welfare released mass energies for new experiments in social change. Although Marx and Gandhi were both opposed to the profit-motivated capitalist society and both had dedicated themselves to the oppressed and the poor, Gandhism differs from Marxism in that while the latter proves the inevitability of socialism with economic arguments, Gandhism accepts it on ethical grounds. Marxism is based on materialism, with confidence in human rationality, Gandhism relies on spirituality and holds that the basis of social progress is not matter but mind. Multiplication of wants is a worthy objective to Marx, sublimation of wants is Gandhi's ideal. Class war and expropriation of private property are the Marxian steps to socialism, the gandhian way is the way of satyagraha and trusteeship.

Gandhi's experiments in trusteeship began as far back as 1894-95 in Natal, where he treated his employees as co-workers and established a partnership firm with them. Be it Polak or Mrs. Polak, Madhynoo, Kallabach, Maganlal or Chhaganlal Gandhi, Gandhi's private law firm grew into a social institution and his clerks became his partners in a great experiment in trusteeship and collective living. Mr. Ritch gave up

his commercial firm to be an armed clerk with Gandhi and a co-worker. Miss Durr became more of a daughter to Gandhi than a mere office stenotypist. Miss Schiman responded to the gandhian method of employment by refusing to draw more than £10 a month and scolded Gandhi when he urged her to take more. Mr Albert West gave up his own press to join the *Dakshin Express* press at Durban on a salary of £10 a month, which was reduced to £5 when he joined Gandhi's *Phoenix* settlement. On his return to India, Gandhi founded the Navajvan Mudranalaya with the financial support of Shankerlal Banker in July 1919. In 1929, on his sixtieth birthday, Gandhi made a public trust of the Navajvan Karyalaya, with property worth Rs 1 lakh. 'Henceforth all activities of the institution were to be conducted on a self-supporting basis, with the object of preaching nonviolence for the attainment of *swara*, propaganda for *khadi* and *swadeshi* in all walks of life, removal of untouchability and communal unity'.<sup>10</sup> His experiments in labour-management relations in Ahmedabad were extensions of the trusteeship philosophy to the area of industrial relations. Gandhi encouraged Jamsedji Bhai in establishing a Jamsedji Bhai Sewa Trust on August 7, 1942 for the promotion of the health and spiritual and social welfare of man, particularly women, children, villagers, illiterate, backward and suppressed people and for other charitable purposes. In a way, the cluster of public social institutions which he developed for the implementation of his constructive program throughout the Indian freedom struggle was essentially motivated by the principles of trusteeship and social welfare.

Vinoba's experiments of *gramdaan*, *blooda*, *sampatdaan* etc. centre upon the postulate of the trusteeship of the means of production for the establishment of a new social order—*sarvodaya* as propounded by Gandhi. Such experiments, particularly in the field of land relations, are being watched by social philosophers throughout the world.

#### *Experiments in social responsibility*

The multi-faced social responsibility of business, towards shareholders, management, labour, the consumer, the state and the community, is often discharged by a variety of approaches, like participative management, shared decision-making, profit-sharing and employee-shareholding schemes. The Bell Telephone Company's objective of paying just salaries, transfer of substantial shareholding to employees in I.C.I. and Compagnie, voluntary dividend limitation and full consultation practised by John Lewis Partnership,<sup>11</sup> Rowntree of York and Lincoln Electric Company, and giving of 20-6 per cent of common stock to its employees by Sears Roebuck of Chicago are instances in point where employee participation has been highly beneficial to shareholders. The company can thus be transformed into a social entity through a combination of

public spirit and shared business sense.

The main characteristics of some of these experiments in social responsibility are given below.

*John Lewis Partnership.* Turned into a co-operative enterprise, the partnership aims at a limited return on capital, fairness to customers, and full partnership with the employees, who are both members and owners of the company and have an effective voice in its affairs, besides sharing in the profits. The company has shown itself capable of dynamic expansion in a very competitive field of retail distribution.

*Harold Gurney Printing Works.* The company has allotted half of its shares to the employees through a Friendly Society, registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act.

*J.T. Dove of Newcastle.* Herbert Dove, the proprietor, has given away his controlling ordinary shares to a Pension Fund Trust for the benefit of the employees and to which the local university appoints the trustees.

*The Kalamazoo Company of Northfield, Birmingham.* The company has a trust to hold shares for the employees and to buy shares, as and when they are available, with the declared intention that 'the firm eventually will be wholly owned by its employee-members and thus achieve a longer independent life than otherwise under private ownership'.

*The Glacier Metal Company.* The company has made a notable experiment, designed to make management formally more accountable to the managed through the development of representative and legislative systems in its management, together with an appeals procedure, which account for a high degree of internal accountability and control.

*Stearns, Roebuck & Co. of Chicago.* The company launched an employees' share ownership scheme, besides the saving schemes after retirement, under which every employee who has completed one year's service in the company becomes a member of the company's saving and profit-sharing pension fund at the rate of 2 per cent of his salary with matching contribution from employers, or double or treble on the basis of length of service. Normally 11 per cent of the company's net income (in 1968 it was \$41.5 million) is put into the fund which is used for the purchase of the company's shares. The voting rights are exercised through a committee. On retirement, the worker may opt to continue as a shareholder or get cash payment.

*The Krupp Experiment.* Alfred Krupp drew an agreement 15 days before his death on July 30, 1967. Following his will, on November 29, 1967, the Krupp headquarters dutifully announced an Alfred Krupp Von Bohlen Und Halbach Foundation, whereby a joint stock company was formed on January 2, 1968. Gunter Vopeluang, the new head, declared that the firm would never again produce guns, since the company had a bad experience with its weapons business for many decades.

According to agreement, Allied's tax was entitled to \$500,000 annually before the company could meet any other obligations, including those to the Government.<sup>1</sup>

There are some other experiments concerning different concepts of social responsibility, viz. Brown Engineering Co. Ltd., Farmer Service Ltd., P. A. Management Consultants Ltd., Spackley Ltd. (Caracas) in U.K.; The Carlsberg Brewing Co. in Denmark; The Sparks Corporation, The Bookplate Printing Co. in U.S.A.; Unilever in Brant, and Les Constructeurs de Travail (divers) in France.

#### *Carl Zeiss Works experiment*

The idea of regulating the relationship between parties in the industry and the community on the basis of trust was introduced in 1886 by Prof. Ernst Abbe in the Carl Zeiss Works, the well-known optical glass factory at Jena in Germany. The constitution of the Zeiss Foundation, which covered its 7,000 working members, operated successfully from 1886 to 1933, when Nazi intervention and the second world war affected its working. By 1933, however, the old technical workers of Jena restored the old Zeiss Foundation at Oberkochen in West Germany.

The first article of the 122-article constitution of the Zeiss Foundation states that the objects of Zeiss are—economic security of the business and its future expansion, well-being of the workers and efficient service to customers, welfare of the neighbourhood, advancement of scientific studies, research, teaching etc.

The Board of Trustees delegate their duties to a deputy, whose office is quasi-judicial and who is appointed for life from the senior ranks of the state service and is consulted by the Boards of Management for different departments on all questions of policy. Each department of the company is administered by three or four managers, who are generally chosen from within the company and must have been members of the firm for at least two years. The members of the Boards of Management are not permitted to have shares in the business and their minimum remuneration is so related to that of workers that it may never exceed ten times the average wage of the latter. Besides bonus, the worker is given security in employment, in that after three years' service with the company, half-a-year's salary has to be paid to him on dismissal, and after five years' service, an employee becomes eligible for pension and is entitled on dismissal to a sum equal to one-eighth of the total wage or salary earned during his service. Everyone working in the Foundation knows that he is not working for persons more or less foreign to the working community, but for the preservation of the enterprise with which his future is intimately linked and for the community.

*Scott Bader Commonwealth and Democracy Experiment*

Ernest Bader, who went to Britain from Switzerland during 1914-18, transferred the ownership of his small but prosperous firm manufacturing industrial chemicals—£2 million annual sales and a complement of over 100 people—to its employees. The affairs of the company are administered by a Community Council of twelve—one of them elected by secret ballot from among members, two appointed by the Board of Directors, and the twelfth a prominent personality of the neighbourhood. The experiment of the Scott Bader Commonwealth has been extended through Democracy<sup>1</sup>—the Society for Democratic Integration in Industry, consisting of over 120 supporting members, with seven operating companies as practitioners. They function on the basis of the following principles of Democracy.

- (1) Every undertaking should be carried on as a joint concern by all those working for it forming an organic cooperative group bound together for some necessary social purpose.
- (2) An undertaking to be socially healthy will (a) treat every human being in it as an individual to be helped to develop his or her full capabilities and talents within the discipline of a shared purpose, (b) control its size (number limited to 250 by articles) or, in the case of a larger firm, decentralise its activities so that everyone is able to embrace them in his mind and imagination; (c) seek to establish mutually helpful relations with those who use its products and with the community in which it is situated, realising that it is part of a national or international community with responsibilities beyond its own immediate interests.
- (3) There must be a closely defined partnership, which may take various forms, between those who contribute leadership, management, capital, technical skill and any kind of labour of hand or brain and in which each will have recognised status, duties and rights without any exploration of man by man and without any section having an exclusive right to ownership, control or profits.
- (4) The form of ownership and control of the business must, therefore, make legal provision for the whole body to express the principle of democratic integration and a sense of belonging by all its members.

The philosophy of the experiment may be summed up as integrating workers as co-owners with management; union between private capital and social capital; collective ownership; transformation of commercial responsibility into co-responsibility, and a brotherly social climate and a feeling of belonging as in a family. Democracy principles and others represent an ideological transformation of industry into living communities and basic democracies, where the company is chartered and

consisted in a form of common-ownership of the means of production. Democracy is designed to cultivate and supercede the best features of both capitalism and communism, balanced self-interest and creative aspiration based on ownership of the means of production. What is required is the 'will' and 'demon' to realize a radical change in economic life, making such commitment a basic plank in the search for a better society.

Some of the distinctions between a conventional company and a Democracy commonwealth are obvious. While a conventional company bestows absolute power in the hands of a Board of Directors, the constitutional power in a Democracy commonwealth is vested jointly in the workers, who become members of the commonwealth and not merely wage-slaves and have direct participation in management. While in a conventional company even the schemes of profit-sharing do not change the wage-employee relationship (even workers holding shares do not feel they are proprietors), the constitution of Democracy demands 60 per cent profits for ploughing back, 20 per cent for distribution to commonwealth members and 2 per cent for Democracy educational and charitable causes. While managerial power and power for disciplinary action lie with the Board of Directors in a conventional company, in a Democracy a council of sixteen—eight of whom are elected by the members of commonwealth—is responsible for settling questions of injustice or disputes, with powers of decision over internal affairs. While earning of maximum profits for the shareholders is the chief motive behind the operations of a conventional company, the triple objectives of expansion and broadening of activities, additional income to members and increased social contribution are the spiritual motives behind Democracy. While in a conventional company shareholders hold shares as individual property and generally exercise voting rights once at the annual general meeting only, all shares in a Democracy commonwealth are held jointly by management and workers alike and the capital is thereby socialized or neutralized in terms expressed in the constitution by common agreement. In fact, no single person owns any shares. In a conventional company, the corporation has no soul or conscience and is based on the outmoded concept of the master-servant relationship with a hierarchical organizational structure, a type of neo-feudalism. The great king of money power—represented by a group of people intent on making money—sits on his industrial throne with deans in charge of the various ministerial departments and cars, knights, squares and seats in their proper places on the grand organizational tree. In Democracy, the corporate conscience is reflected in the family spirit, through building of one as a centre of collective energy and through harmonizing itself by the distributive process. The wage yoke is eliminated and employers are not treated as gods or mere cyphers or calculated as labour cost, but enjoy equality of status at the individual level, anchored as they are

in a constitution based on the ideals of Christian brotherhood

*The participating company*

George Geyder suggests reforms which would 'bring the voice of workers, customers and community into the councils of big business, not as a grace but as of right'.<sup>7</sup> His main proposal, in the context of the U.K. environment, is for a new type of limited liability company to be known as a participating company. Such a company would have a general purpose clause in its Memorandum specifying its social responsibilities, workers would be made members of the company and enjoy parallel rights to those of shareholders, dividends would be subject to compulsory limitation, and provision would be made for an independent social audit of its activities. The company articles would provide for the representation of these interested both on the Board and at the Annual General Meeting and for submission to the trustees appointed by the Board of Trade any dispute between the directors and other interests. Any company could establish a social audit voluntarily by placing an adequate amount in the hands of four trustees, to be appointed by the company, the trade union council, the Board of Trade and independent bodies. Such an audit may enquire into the company's pricing policies as affecting consumers, labour policies as affecting employees and trade unions, and community policies.

Allen Flinders doubts<sup>8</sup> that the problems of social responsibility can merely be solved by writing a general purposes clause into the Memorandum of a participating company. According to him, law cannot override the social realities of industry. If the industry lacks a common purpose, the state cannot give it one. The law may be used to suppress the free expression of conflict, as in totalitarian countries, merely on the pretence of common purpose.

*Trusts in India: the experience*

Some of the renowned captains of Indian industry claim that their industrial and business enterprise was but a trust held in the interests of the community at large. There is no denying the fact that some enlightened entrepreneurs have created trusts for charitable and public purposes out of the profits of their enterprises and have set high standards in labour welfare and other social obligations. Leading Indian business houses like Tata, Mahalal, Godrej, Khatau, Alkesh, T.V. Sundaram, Kirlankar, Birla, B.R. Shriker, Banger, Jardine-Henderson and others can be mentioned in this regard.

In India, according to a survey<sup>9</sup> on the working of trusts conducted by the Department of Company Affairs, Government of India, out of 75 trusts (with above Rs 1 lakh of total assets) surveyed, 62 were for charitable and public purposes with total assets of Rs 37 crore. 61 trusts

were associated with business groups. Though most of the charitable and public purpose trusts have laudable objectives, such as advancement of learning, research, distress relief, running of hospitals, advancement of public welfare etc., they generally do not conform to the standards required under the concept of trusteeship as would be evident from the following table incorporating the position with regard to trusts with assets of above Rs 1 crore in 1963-64.

| Business group    | No of trusts | Assets (Rs crores) | Investments in same group | PERCENTAGES                 |                                     |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                   |              |                    |                           | Investments in other groups | Buildings and government securities |
| Malathi           | 16           | 2.4                | 33.67                     | —                           | 30.64                               |
| Birla             | 8            | 7.5                | 23.40                     | 5.19                        | 4.41                                |
| Tata              | 6            | 4.4                | 90.21                     | 2.17                        | 7.62                                |
| Birla-Hindger     | 3            | 2.9                | 83.33                     | 1.18                        | 8.34                                |
| Bangar Industries | 2            | 1.04               | 52.06                     | 28.65                       | 14.52                               |
| Henderson         | 1            | 2.3                | 28.82                     | 53.75                       | 17.19                               |

Vijay Merchant has experimented<sup>12</sup> with the trusteeship concept in his own enterprises, Hindustan Spinning and Weaving Mills, Bombay, where 'he has looked upon his workers' problems, needs and difficulties purely from a humanitarian angle, considering that the employee is not merely a means of production but above all a human being first and always'. Following this approach, Merchant looked after his workers and their families from the economic, social and medical points of view. The results have been satisfactory. The expenditure costs approximately Rs 50,000 a year, barely .01 per cent of the total sales, the amount being considered an investment in the goodwill of labour. The concrete outcome has been that the shortcomings in all the departments of the mills have come down considerably and every worker is conscious of the fact that defects in production reduce the productivity of the mills.

#### *Dr Lohia's model: the trust corporation*

Dr Ram Manohar Lohia, the avowed Gandhian socialist, proposed an Indian Trusteeship Bill<sup>13</sup> in the Lok Sabha in March 1967 with a view to providing an opportunity to owners of private and public companies (initially with a subscribed capital of more than Rs 10 lakh and/or employment of 500 persons) to function on the basis of the principles of democratic management<sup>14</sup> and the concept of trusteeship as visualized



by Gandhi. Though the Bill could not be taken up by the Lok Sabha on technical grounds, for reasons of government objection and the untimely death of Dr Lohia, the model as laid down by him outlines the processing and administration of a Trust Corporation, should India sincerely wish to try the experiment.

The salient features of Dr Lohia's model of a Trust Corporation may be enumerated as follows.

(1) A company may by a resolution in its general meeting, passed by a majority of its shareholders present and voting, declare itself to be a Trust Corporation.

(2) The Registrar, Joint Stock Companies, shall arrange to take stock of the assets and liabilities of the company and shall constitute a panchayat of trustees to supervise, control and direct the internal managing trustee. The panchayat shall consist of not more than 14 trustees made up as follows:

- (i) Shareholders to elect at the general meeting: 5 trustees.
- (ii) Trade union of the company to elect 5 trustees (one from the managerial staff, one jobber and the rest from other sections of the staff).
- (iii) The Registrar may appoint 5 Trustees, consisting of an expert each from:

- (1) Planning Commission (for coordination of Corporation activities with the national plan),
- (2) Ministry of Commerce and Industry;
- (3) Department of Company Law Administration;
- (4) Department of Labour of the State Government,
- (5) A member of the Municipal Committee or Corporation within whose jurisdiction the head office of the company is situated.

(iv) The internal managing trustee ex-officio.

(3) The panchayat shall decide all major questions relating to the management of the business of the Trust Corporation. It shall frame rules, approve its annual production plans and annual accounts, take decisions on reconstructions, purchases, sales, loans, orders, wages, salaries, bonus to employees and interest, if any, to shareholders. The panchayat shall elect a chairman from amongst its members. The panchayat shall supervise the work of the managing trustee, examine his reports and give him instructions for general conduct of the work.

(4) The net profit of the Corporation, after due provisions, shall be credited to the Income Tax slice of the Ministry of Finance, to be allocated to the different states according to the recommendations of the Finance Commission.

(5) The employees of the Trust Corporation shall not demand any

rise in wages which is not commensurate with the earnings of an average villager or the uniform scales of wages determined by the Ministry of Labour.

(6) Works Committees of employers shall be formed in every department of the Trust Corporation for explaining decisions of the panchayat to employees, maintenance of discipline and execution of welfare schemes of the Trust Corporation.

(7) The first managing trustee shall continue in office for five years or till the age of 60 and can be removed by the panchayat for criminal breach of trust. His remuneration shall be fixed by contract between him and the panchayat. The first managing trustee may recommend a successor to his office but the final appointment shall be made by the panchayat.

(8) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited by the Auditor-General of India and shall be placed before a joint annual general meeting of all employees of the Trust Corporation and all the shareholders of the company.

(9) Any industry or undertaking whose management has been taken over by the Government under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act 1951 and entrusted to the Registrar may be treated as a Trust Corporation. New Trust Corporations may be floated *ad initio* by an individual entrepreneur investing 50 per cent of the subscribed capital, the Government contributing the other half and the total equity not exceeding Rs 20 lakh.

The above outlines of a Trust Corporation are sketchy and need comprehensive statutes providing for ownership and management of trusteeship business, which as Gandhi had hoped 'would be a gift from India to the world'. Gandhi admitted that trusteeship is an idea perhaps impossible of complete realization but not on that account a legal fiction. The perfection of trusteeship may mean the total repudiation of the idea of property and in that sense perfect trusteeship is like Euclid's definition of a point, an abstraction, and therefore equally unattainable, but if we strive for it, we may go forward further towards realising equality on earth than by any other method. The basic question that confronts Indian management today is 'Must we allow ourselves to be swept away by the law of economic determinism or can we evolve a society in which there is a blending of the essence of our heritage and the products of science and technology?' The affluent Americans,<sup>18</sup> the acquisitive Englishmen, the avaricious Russians and the aggressive Chinese will not heed our pious talk about the philosophy of trusteeship. As long as we do not practice what we preach, the world will continue to consider us either knaves or fools or perhaps both.

1. 'A trust is the relationship which arises whenever a person called a trustee is compelled to hold property, whether real or personal and whether by legal or equitable title, for the benefit of some persons (*Creditors of a trust*) or some object permitted by law, in such a way that real benefit of the property accrues, not to the trustee, but to the beneficiaries or other objects of the trust.'

2. *Margan*, October 15, 1962. Reproduced in original, with Gandhi's annotations, in India International Centre, *Social Responsibility of Business*, pp. 21-22, Mumbai, Bombay.

3. *Wadhvani, Mahatma*, Vol. 2, p. 203.

4. For details, please consult: Flinders, Pomeroy and Woodward, *Experiments in Industrial Democracy: A Study of the John Lewis Partnership* (Pitman and Faber Ltd., 1962).

5. Wilhoit Manchester, 'The Arms of Krups (1857-1957)', *Impulse*, October, 1962.

6. For details, please consult India International Centre, *Social Responsibility of Business*, pp. 139-176, Mumbai, Bombay.

7. O. Gwyer, *The Responsible Company* (Oxell Blackwell, 1961).

8. India International Centre, *Social Responsibility of Business*, pp. 229-236, Mumbai, Bombay.

9. 'Working of Trusts in India, A Survey', *Company News and Notes*, Annual Number 1976, Department of Company Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi.

10. Vijay Morebani, *Trusteeship Management*, Economic and Scientific Research Foundation, New Delhi.

11. The Bill could not be presented in the Lok Sabha because the President of India did not accord permission for presentation under Constitution provision 107 (1). For details of the Indian Trusteeship Bill, please consult, *Am. (Hindi Monthly)*, September-October 1969.

12. Prof. Kenneth Walker in his *Trusts Management Lectures*, 1970 has propounded four forms of Industrial Democracy: democratisation of ownership, democratisation of the government of the enterprise, democratisation of the forms of employment, and democratisation of management.

13. 'I am certain that we are on the right track, because American businessmen are rapidly developing a sense of trusteeship. The public is uppermost in the minds of most people who are running companies today. Of course, operating at a profit is our first responsibility. That is the basis of what we do. But beyond that, management and directors increasingly look at their role as a public trust.' Prof. Donald E. David, former Dean of Harvard Business School (quoted by Don. H. Ford Jr. in *Management Affairs in a New Society*, McGraw Hill, N.Y., p. 16).

# *Imperatives of education for liberation*

K. P. BHADURNA

WHATEVER ADJECTIVES AND APPELLATIONS may be attached to education, they can make no difference to its objective. The cardinal aim of education for man is 'development of the self'. This process of self-realisation is such as helps one's fullest expression without dependence upon any outward agency. Being a living organism, man, by nature, is self-developing. Education has only to help this process of development. Man in India in the second century B.C. had declared the two aims of education to be *vaiśa* (virtue) and *śāśa* (perseverance). And this has been corroborated also by modern educationists like Koss and Nuss. These educationists have also talked of the two attributes of the human mind, namely, the power of recollection (*manas*) and the clan vital (*horme*). The development of man's potentialities constitutes his very becoming. Man has a natural right to be, or to become, what he is. The acceptance of this right constitutes the correct foundation of education. Therefore, education is not imparted, it is received, it is not making others learn but learning oneself. Vascha has pointed out that the word 'teaching' does not occur in the ancient Indian texts on education, but 'learning' does. 'Teaching' is artificial, whereas 'learning' is natural. Our education should be natural, not artificial. Hence, instead of making others learn, education has to become a process of learning. Such education alone can guarantee the freedom of man. From this point of view, education is a far wider proposition than mere literacy. This is what led Gandhi to describe education as a process 'from the womb to the grave'. Bookish knowledge and literacy are mere glimpses of education, just as only a part of the iceberg is outwardly visible, with the bulk of it remaining submerged in water. Education, in fact, is the creation of such an atmosphere as would give one the opportunity, the tools and the inspiration to become a man. According to an ancient Indian definition it is the condition in which an

individual learns the art of becoming a *parusha*. Hence education can also be termed as that which liberates one from the shackles which hinder the process of becoming a man. In a word 'education is that which liberates', as *vidya ya vimuktaye*. The liberation of man must free him from all impediments whatever. The highest endeavour both for the individual and society is the freedom of man. It should be kept in mind that we are talking of the freedom of man and not of the individual. The Indian system of thought distinguishes man from an individual.

Education so far has failed to deliver the goods; instead of making man free, it has, as Rousseau said, only put him in chains. And these chains today have become a part of man's culture. Every society seeks to achieve its ends largely through its educational policy and programs. But nowhere in the world today is education able to achieve the desired social goals. This has led to stark dissatisfaction and anarchy in both education and society. The education of today has failed both in realising its objective and in fulfilling national aspirations. The reasons are mainly two. First, it led to a limitless increase in man's aspirations without leading to a concurrent increase in his potentialities and capabilities. The disintegration of man began by the defect of education has been intensified by the help accorded to it by science. Man has today overcome the vast distances of the earth but the gulf that separates him from his neighbourhood is widening. Education and science are both engaged in working for affluence, whereas what we need is richness. The result is that the world is sick with the frightening 'poverty of affluence'. This situation has certainly led to the affluence of nations but it has also brought along a concurrent pauperism of man.

Secondly, since man and society are tied by mutual relationships, misuse of these leads to their disintegration. The systems of education as they are today have absolutely no regard for human relationships. Whatever semblance of relationship there may be, is negative. The result is that the natural as also the extraneous balance between man and society or the nation has been disturbed. The higher educational institutions, in fact, are engaged in creating and promoting this sort of imbalance. They have become cradles for these defects of education and hotbeds of violence, suppression, exploitation and corruption. Life there is suffocated, since monopoly and drabness constitute their only function.

While this situation is doing measurable harm to society, we also find a small minority class extracting the utmost profit out of it and making an organised effort to maintain it. Which is this class? The class in power, of course. The class with the help of the law, wealth and arms is determined to make society its slave. Never have differences between the power-class and the people been so glaring as today.

Where there exists a dictatorship or a monarchy, the fight is for democracy, but where democracy already exists it is for the freedom of the people. High time that in the fight between power and freedom, education should decide in the latter's favour. In Gandhi, India had a man who in the fight between power and freedom declared his unstated support to freedom and for whom education was the medium for its attainment. He devised for a free human society an educational system which he called 'Basic Education'. John Dewey hailed Gandhi's system as the 'greatest discovery so far in the field of education'. Today thinkers like Yaneba and J. Krishnamurti are advocating a similar type of education. Education for freedom is the need of the hour.

This type of education has three basic requirements. First, it should be accepted that a free social order can be created only by free human beings brought up on a system of education free from the baseful influences of the state and business. Education and science are today dominated by these two forces, where once religion held sway. But if education and science are dominated and controlled by either religion, wealth or government they will create only slavery, fear, lawlessness, suppression and exploitation. Religion, wealth and political power have centred in the same individual or group, and this phenomenon has given birth to a strange form of dictatorial power. We agree with Paulo Freire when he says that the entire present system of education only nourishes this totalitarianism. Mistaking this slavery as culture, man is speedily becoming adept at it. Now as always, whenever a fight has been carried on, it is directed not at freedom but strangely enough at the 'ownership of slavery'. These so-called fighters, often mistakenly labelled revolutionaries, have never disowned the values of slavery, what they fight for is nothing else but 'ownership of slaves'. If this had not been so the French Revolution would not have given birth to Napoleon and the Russian to Stalin. The so-called revolutionary events in Russia, Latin America, Africa, China or elsewhere have given rise only to human slavery and nurtured it. China witnessed its revolution in 1949, but even so there arose the need for a cultural revolution which also failed. These events were not directed towards the freedom of man or the establishment of a free social order. It is in the nature of a revolution to be essentially cultural, and hence educational. It cannot take place through uneducational media or in an uneducational atmosphere. The second fundamental condition of education for freedom is that it cannot be achieved through wealth, weapon or power.

As said earlier, power and education are incompatible terms. Education incorporates the unconditional freedom of man, whereas power aims at creating followers or slaves. The latter considers the granting of freedom as its byproduct whereas freedom is never granted, it is naturally acquired. Due to this fundamental dichotomy the state allows

freedom to its citizens only so long as this freedom does not pose a threat to it. Whenever and wherever the criteria pose this threat, the powers that be, whether national or foreign, suppress them with all their strength. As weapons get more and more formidable and sophisticated, as the demand for disarmament, though not out of rationality so much as out of fear, increases, as wars become more and more meaningless, uneconomic and unfeasible, the iron grip of governments and their harassment, suppression and exploitation of their own people will intensify. This process will lead to the disappearance of whatever residue of democracy there may be and to the rise of totalitarianism on a lasting basis. The queer phenomenon is that totalitarianism, militarism and autocracy have flourished everywhere irrespective of their being a democracy, dictatorship or monarchy. Armaments are today utilized less for defence and more for suppressing people inside the country. This situation can be countered not by armament, wealth or state power but by the ceaseless efforts of organized and classless communities. This is another imperative of education for liberation.

Another aspect will have to be considered. The cardinal principle of education is liberation, whereas state power is inherently opposed to it. This is one valid reason that education cannot be entrusted to state power. But even if we presume the presence of enlightened and unattached rulers like Janaka (regarded as vidha or unconcerned about his body and one facts unattached to the state), the level of consciousness attained by humanity today, is such that it cannot and should not be brought down to the level of a "Guardian Father". To attempt this would amount to turning the wheels of progress backwards. The glamour attached to rulers (ill recently the halo surrounding the head, common in pictures of religious reformers and seers, was found in pictures of rulers as well) is fast on the wane. Thus, keeping education aloof from power is in tune with the spirit of the times. There is another reason for this. Governments now as always are never representative of the entire mass of the people, but only of a few individuals, groups or political parties; and they utilize education only to serve their own narrow ends. This is the reason that histories are often re-written. Here democratic and non-democratic governments act alike. Hence education fails to become all-embracing and universal.

Similarly, education has to be freed from business. An objective study of the researches in the fields of science and education will make it clear that they benefit only traders, industrialists and middlemen. Our universities and industrial institutes are busy inventing such techniques of advertisement and publicity, media of communication and medicines and methods of treatment (in the name of health and physical well-being) in order to guide and control the subconscious mind of the customer and make him buy the desired product or the technique

of the seller. Business and government have now joined hands with a view to twisting man's thinking in a desired way. In the past business did the same with dharma (religion) also. When religion got transported to the market, it became a commodity and lost its potentialities. Religion today does not view man as something emanating from God; it views him only as a customer. Business also views man as a customer, and the government views him as a voter. The teacher is also being looked upon as a commodity. This is the process of the dehumanisation of man. In order to achieve freedom, education has to be delivered from the clutches of both business and government.

This leads us to the third imperative: the slogan-call 'Teachers of the world unite!' Such teachers as have made the search for knowledge (knowledge being another name for truth) their religion and vocation will have to unite and warn the wealthy and the powerful to keep their hands off education. But where else, are such teachers to be found? Teacher, scientist, artist or thinker—all have either become courtiers sycophanting those in power or are engaged in intellectual prostitution. If it were not so, they would not have sunk so low in the eyes of society and of their own students who even disdain helping them in their material and spiritual privations. The teacher of today is afraid of his own students and often gets beaten by them. Such teachers have not only contributed to the moral disintegration of the students, but have also become supporters of the status quo which rightly angers today's youth. They have lost the faith of their students, the only prop of a teacher. Those few teachers who have audaciously earned this faith are respected both by their students and by society.

If teachers today have lost favour, it is their own fault. They have lost faith both in their religion, which is education, and their profession, which is teaching. They resort to suppression and inducements instead of explaining their viewpoints to the students and the people. They are more interested in fighting municipal, assembly or parliamentary elections than in teaching. A teacher considers a political leader, an administrator or a wealthy person to be more responsible than himself. One who is not self-respecting cannot respect others. The teacher has pinned his faith on politics and business instead of education, and that is why our educational institutions have become the abode of political gossipings. This is nothing but atheism. (I am here using the word 'atheism' not in the sense of rejection of God but of *looma*, i.e. action.) And this lack of faith cannot lead to any fruitful work. It is imperative, therefore, that teachers should turn to the Sophist doctrine: "Know thy own self".

According to Vincha, if teachers of the world could forge a unity and remaining neutral, fearless and truth-teaching, develop a system of knowledge and knowledge-based action, education for freedom might be



come a possibility. In any future society of man as to trust liberty, equality and fraternity as his constant guides, the teacher will have to be the moulder and cooperation and education will form the method and the technique. A society based on power has weapons as the implements and the soldier as the regulator; but one based on cooperation (such a society is bound to be democratic and equalitarian) will have education as the implement and the teacher as the regulator. These ideas of Dharmadas Mazumdar are worth considering.

In such an organized community of teachers, a teacher must have faith in his vocation, i.e. education; he must be a teacher and a supporter of total truth, i.e. he must eschew party-politics of any sort as these represent only partial truth and hence are supporters of untruth; he must recognize the entire society as his field of work. Such a community of teachers, suggests Varsha, should be respected and recognized as the judiciary, if not more.

The important question is not what and how to teach but what for. And this is the crucial point which education and its organizers have been tactfully avoiding and on which even teachers have ceased to think. But unless this question is solved, the other problems will elude solution. If once the aims of education become crystal clear to us then since education and society have a common goal, the means for their fulfilment can be found easily. The problem is defining the goals of society. Total anarchy in this field is the order of the day. The social goals can no longer be defined or realized by religion as it has lost its capacity to do so; nor by power of arms as such power is corrupt and anti-people and has gloriously been exposed as the very negation of man. Power of arms is no strength at all as it is only remnant of man's savage past. This is a task that can be performed only by education, an education free from the power of arms, of wealth and of the state. Freedom of education, therefore, needs today such a worldwide movement as may harness education for this new type of constructive defiance. Education has not to demonstrate the way for individuals or for society as that will constitute a negation of man's right. It has simply to work as a guide for humanity.

# *Meditations on Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed—III*

---

THOMAS MYSEL

## I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST

THE HOLY GHOST IS GOD IMMANENT, God pervading the universe, and therefore the divinity, the soul of man, what Socrates called his daemon, what the Quakers call the inner light. 'Know ye not,' wrote St Paul, 'that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?'<sup>1</sup>

Gandhi maintained that if in striving to become a perfect shramani and experience the supreme identity you completely efface yourself, reducing yourself to zero, you can, by heeding the still small voice within you, receive guidance from the ultimate reality. In fact he was sure that he frequently had such promptings. Here is his description of one of them.

'It relates to my 21 days' fast for the removal of untouchability. I had gone to sleep the night before without the slightest idea of having to declare a fast the next morning. At about 12 o'clock in the night something wakes me up suddenly and some voice—within or without I cannot say—whispers, "Thou must go on a fast." "How many days?" I ask. The voice again said, "Twenty-one days." "When does it begin?" I ask. It says, "You begin tomorrow." That kind of experience has never happened in my life before or after that date." "My mind was unprepared for it, disinclined for it. But the thing came to me as clearly as anything could be."<sup>2</sup> "I saw no form . . . But what I did hear was like a voice from afar and yet quite near. It was as unmistakable as some human voice definitely speaking to me and irresistible. I was not dreaming at the time I heard the voice. The hearing of the voice was preceded by a terrific struggle within me. Suddenly the voice came upon me. I listened, made certain it was the voice and the struggle ceased. I was calm . . . The determination was made accordingly, the date and hour

of the fact stated.<sup>14</sup>

The Mahatma maintained that, although God, the Truth, can appropriately be regarded as personal by those who need that belief, the mystery is not in essence a person. But, as is learned from the three above quotations, the Truth is certainly, according to the Indian leader, an entity with which one can have a personal relationship, what the celebrated modern Jewish philosophers, Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber, named an 'I and Thou relationship'. Determined, like the Bishop of Woolwich and other present-day theologians, to avoid a naive anthropomorphism at all costs, Gandhi sympathized with the Lord Buddha, who shunned needless metaphysical speculation and has, as a result, often been mistakenly thought to be an atheist. 'I have heard it contended times without number,' the Mahatma avowed, 'and I have read in books also claiming to express the spirit of Buddhism that Buddha did not believe in God. In my humble opinion such a belief contradicts the very central fact of Buddha's teaching. In my humble opinion the confusion has arisen over his rejection, and just rejection, of all the base things that passed in his generation under the name of God. He undoubtedly rejected the notion that a being called God was actuated by malice, could repent of his actions, and like the kings of the earth could possibly be open to temptations and bribes and have favourites. His whole soul rose in mighty indignation against the belief that a being called God required for his satisfaction the living blood of animals in order that he might be pleased, animals who were his own creation. He, therefore, reinstated God in the right place and deposed the usurper who for the time being seemed to occupy the White Throne. He emphasized and redeclared the eternal and unalterable existence of the moral government of the universe. He unhesitatingly said that the law was God Himself.'<sup>15</sup>

Gandhi was first and foremost a man of prayer. He fervently proclaimed that if one is to advance spiritually, then, obeying the urge of the inner voice, one must every day indulge in prayer both public and private. 'Prayer', he wrote, 'is the only means of bringing about orderliness and peace and composure in our daily acts'.<sup>16</sup> 'It is a longing of the soul. It is a daily admission of one's weakness'.<sup>17</sup> 'Begin, therefore, your day with prayer, and make it so useful that it may remain with you until the evening. Close the day with prayer so that you may have a peaceful night free from dreams and nightmares. Do not worry about the form of prayer. Let it be any form, it should be such as can put us into communion with the divine. Only, whatever be the form, let not the spirit wander while the words of prayer run on out of your mouth'.<sup>18</sup> 'In heartfelt prayer the worshipper's attention is concentrated on the object of worship, so much so that he is not conscious of anything else besides.'<sup>19</sup>

In his autobiography *Pranishantha* Yogananda recorded the fact that, on his asking Gandhi what, should one find oneself confronted by a cobra, one should do, the Mahatma indicated that one ought to be able, instead of killing it, to calm it by emitting vibrations of love, a procedure which, as the Indian leader at the same time pointed out, it is extremely difficult to follow. And when questioned, just before his assassination, about the stern bomb, the Mahatma said, "I would meet it by peaceful action. . . . I would come out in the open and let the pilot see that I had not the face of evil against him. The pilot would not see my face at such a height, I know. But the longing in my heart that he will not come to harm will reach up to him and his eyes would be opened. Of those thousands who were done to death in Hiroshima by the bombs—if they had died with that peaceful action, died openly with prayer in their hearts without uttering a groan, then the war would not have ended as disgracefully as it has."<sup>10</sup> Thus Gandhi believed that, by exercising a benevolent telepathy and thereby cooperating with the mighty love force of the cosmos, you can influence other living things for their good.

Once upon a time, while Jesus and his disciples were crossing the Sea of Galilee, there arose a heavy squall and, as a result, the waves broke over the boat and swamped it. Jesus being asleep on a cushion in the stern, the others roused him and acquainted him with the very serious danger. Thereupon he stood up, rebuked the wind and said to the water, "Hush. Be still." And at once there was a dead calm. In his book, *Myrae Christianity or the Inner Teachings of the Master*, a work about Jesus, Yogi Ramacharaka, commenting on this incident, maintained that according to the occultal occultists it is of great assistance, if one desires mentally to produce an effect upon person or thing, to express one's wish in the form of a command, that ensuring the maximum concentration of thought. No doubt, should one couch the wish in language of intercession with ultimate reality, there could be brought about within one a similar mental intensity.

Note this couple of sayings attributed to Jesus. "These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."<sup>11</sup> "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do."<sup>12</sup>

In Gandhi's ashram the morning service, which was held at 4.30 a.m., consisted of the recitation of Hindu verses, the singing of a hymn, the repetition of the name of God and the reading of the *Bhagavad-gita*, the last item so arranged that the book was finished every few days, while at the evening service there was first the recitation of the final mantram verses of the second chapter of the *Gita*, then a hymn, and

then the repetition of the name of God. Although these congregational religious exercises were in their construction predominantly Hindu, most of the adherent members being of course of that persuasion, avowedly scriptural texts of other world religions were used as well. In the passage read at the evening service, the last sixteen verses of the second chapter of the Gita, the characteristics of the *sthita-prajna*, that is to say the man of stable understanding, are described, characteristics which, according to the Mahatma, should always be displayed by the true atheist.

When an individual performs his devotions alone, it is essential that he should enjoy privacy, freedom from hurry and the absence of cares and, although customarily commonly sit with legs crossed for the task, we of the west find it more satisfactory to sit in a chair or so forth. I personally prefer to sit in a chair. We Christians have been taught that private prayer should consist of praise, petition, intercession and confession.

Confession can conveniently be made at night and, when this is done, there is no need for you, prostrating before an imagined dictator, deny, flatteringly to implore him for mercy, pity and pardon. Just look quietly back over the day, calmly count your failures and then condemn them utterly. That is enough.

It is sometimes argued that God the infinite, the marvellous artificer of the vast universe, does not wish to be flattered with the praises of us puny earth mortals, and that, as he knows what we want, it is naive to poster him for this and that, but actually praise, petition and intercession should be regarded as one and the same spiritual activity, as a single form of meditation. Make this meditation on getting up of a morning, while your mind is still fresh, and, to begin with, mentally adore ultimate reality. Tell yourself that the creation is good and that you are glad and lucky to be alive. Then, veridically personifying, draw into yourself the love, wisdom, power and health of the Truth. Resolve that today you will consciously manifest those qualities in thought, word and deed and next, practically interceding, send forth the same qualities to all living things, whether such be on this planet or elsewhere, then to your relations, then to your family. Spend at least a quarter of an hour doing this.

Further, in addition to having regular, set periods of introspection, you should think of ultimate reality as frequently as possible day and night, an enterprise which, if you properly train yourself to do it, you can pursue even in noisy factory, crowded bus or busy street. Whenever you have a free moment, repeat such an ejaculation, such a *mantra*, as 'May all be happy; may all be free from disease, may all see what is good, may there be sorrow for none.' Or availing yourself of a more Christian wording, say 'Then whose wisdom rightly and sweetly

ordereth all things, pour forth thy love', or 'Thou whose beauty shinneth through the whole universe, unveil thy glory', the two last taken from the Liberal Catholic liturgy, the first suggested by Swami Advaitananda, leader of the Vedanta movement of Bathurst, near Ranch.

{TO BE CONCLUDED}

- 
1. 1 Cor. xiii. 13.
  2. *Marjorie* 12. 12. 29.
  3. *Marjorie* 14. 5. 34.
  4. *Marjorie* 8. 5. 23.
  5. *Young India* 24. 11. 27.
  6. *Young India* 22. 1. 30.
  7. *Young India* 23. 6. 34.
  8. *Young India* 25. 1. 30.
  9. *Arjuna Charitra in Action*, Edn. 1938, ch. 11.
  10. Margaret Bourke-White, *Halfway to Freedom*, p. 123.
  11. *MI* 66. 17. 18.
  12. *Ib* 74. 32.

## GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION PUBLICATIONS

- Abdul Ghafler Khan* by D.G. Tendulkar. 550 p. Cloth Rs 60.  
*An Anthology of Indian Literatures* edited by K. Santhanam. 724 p.  
Cloth Rs 50.  
*The Sage in Revolt : A Remembrance* by Pran Chopra. 298 p  
Cloth Rs 20  
*Gandhi : 1875-1948. A Detailed Chronology* compiled by C. B.  
Dalal. 218 p. Cloth Rs 30  
*Gandhi : Essential Writings* edited by V. V. Ramana Murthi. 470 p.  
Cloth Rs 25.  
*Liquor Menace in India* by Tek Chand. 251 p. Cloth Rs 20.  
Paper Rs 15  
*Quest for Gandhi* edited by G. Ramachandran and T. K. Mahadevan. 458 p. Cloth Rs 18.  
*Mahatma Gandhi : 100 Years* edited by S. Radhakrishnan. 401 p.  
Cloth Rs 17.50.  
*Truth and Nonviolence* edited by T. K. Mahadevan. 460 p. Cloth  
Rs 15.  
*Gandhi : His Relevance for Our Times* edited by G. Ramachandran  
and T. K. Mahadevan. 393 p. Cloth Rs 15.  
*Sword of Gold* by Roy Walker. 225 p. Cloth Rs 12.50. Paper Rs 7.50  
*Civilian Defence* edited by T. K. Mahadevan, Adam Roberts and  
Gene Sharp. 285 p. Cloth Rs 12.  
*Saga of Satyagraha* by R. R. Dwekar. 248 p. Cloth Rs 9. Paper  
Rs 5.  
*Metaphysical Foundation of Mahatma Gandhi's Thought*  
by Surendra Varma. 177 p. Cloth Rs 8.50. Paper Rs 5.  
*Gandhian Thought* by J. B. Kripalani. 281 p. Cloth Rs 6.50.  
*Gandhi and Communal Unity* by S. Abid Hussain. 151 p  
Paper Rs 4.75.  
*Great Soul* by Harryman Maurer. 104 p. Paper Rs 3.75.  
*Talking of Gandhi* by Francis Watson. 141 p. Paper Rs 3.50  
*Freedom from Fear* by Jawaharlal Nehru. 74 p. Paper Rs. 1.  
*Whither India?* 102 p. Paper Rs. 1.  
*Nonviolence after Gandhi*. 93 p. Paper Rs. 1.  
*I Want a Job or What Can I Do?* by Richard B. Gregg. 39 p.  
Paper 50 Paise.

Available at

GANDHI BOOK HOUSE

Rajghat, New Delhi-1 (Tel. 373519)

*Enjoy during the Summer Vacation  
the beauty and coolness of the  
KULU Valley at*

## **SAPUTARA**

**(The Sylvan Beauty of Gujarat)**

Saputara, the New Hill Resort in Gujarat, is situated on the second highest plateau on the Sahyadri range running through Gujarat State in midst of green and dense forest of Dangs. The hill resort is above mean sea level. Its maximum temperature in summer is 28°7°C and, therefore, its climate is cool and bracing. It is easily accessible all the year round as it has been linked up by all weather asphalt roads having link on one hand with Bilimora on Western Railway via Waghal and Ahwa and on the other with Nasik.

Regular S.T. buses are also plying from Ahwa and Bilimora. Holiday Homes, Dormitories and Rest House are available for occupation at reasonable rates.

*For detailed information please write to*

Commissioner of Tourism,  
Government of Gujarat,  
Sachivalaya,  
Block No. 2,  
Gandhinagar,  
(Ahmedabad)  
Tel. 2439

Tourist Officer,  
Air Lines Building,  
Near Rajapalce Cinema,  
Lal Darwaja, Ahmedabad-1,  
Tel. 24726

Asstt. Director of Information  
Saputara Hill Resort,  
Saputara, Dangs Dist. Ahwa.



# GANDHI MARG

INDEX OF AUTHOR, TITLE AND SUBJECT-IN-TITLE

1973

- Abdullah, Sheikh 7  
Anand, Moh. K. 9  
*History of Gandhi's Nonviolence, the 84*  
*Apostle's Creed 159*  
Appadurai, A. 11  
*Approach to nonviolence education 141*  
Bahuguna, K. P. 325  
Balasubramanian, V. 34  
*Beyond democracy and socialism 162*  
Bhattacharya, Buddhadev 385  
Bibliography, a 251  
Byles, Marc B. 167  
Chaudhri, Indir 156  
Chen, Babubhai M. 17  
*Crowing dilemma, the 1*  
Das, Amritananda 190  
Dasgupta, D. N. 191  
Dasgupta, Sugata 262  
*Democracy, socialism and Gandhi 184*  
Dendin 264  
Dasgupta, R. R. 34, 369  
Dargadas 19, 272  
Edwards, I. 107, 179, 343  
*Education for liberation 323*  
Equilibrium state, the 211  
*Experiment in trusteeship management 311*  
Fernandes, Archbishop 24  
Franklin, Roger 126  
*Gandhi and the Apostle's Creed 159-179*  
*Gandhi and the directive principle of state policy*  
*Gandhi's perception of social change in India after independence, a 304*  
Gandhi, democracy, socialism and 184  
Gandley, martyrdom of 136  
Gandhi's sayings 34  
Gandhi's thought 159  
Gupta, Devendra Kumar 27  
Hyslop, Thomas 196, 329  
Hick, Ivan 296  
*Imperatives of education for liberation 325*  
*India 1971: some crucial questions & India since independence 304*  
*Is your journey necessary? 126*  
Joshi, I. 173  
John, V. V. 193  
Knowledge, from to 110  
Kopale, J. B. 195  
Kotzer, Herbert M. 38  
Liberation, education for 323  
From to knowledge 110  
Long live Rajya 1

*Looking into the future: 1939-1970*  
151

Machwe, Prabhakar 213

Mahatma's martyrdom, the 133

Mahish, Harekrishna 31

Mayurda, R.C. 197, 274

Malhotra, S.I. 199

Malkani, K.R. 33, 199

Mankar, D.R. 36, 297

Martyrdom, the Mahatma's 133

*Martyrdom of Gandhi* 133

Mendonsa, Dennis L. 217

*Meditations on Gandhi and the  
Apostle's Creed* 156, 321

Meiricks, Cecilia 138

*Military as a target of protest, the*  
38

Mishra, S.N. 300

Mody, Poo 266

Mukerjee, Himu 202

Namboodiripad, E.M.S. 284

Narayan, Shrinani 38, 208

Naria, V.R. 308

Nonviolent revolution 141

Oswy, Bob 141

Paid, R.K. 289

*Peace research: the radical out-  
rage* 226

*Peace celebration of the Mahat-  
ma's martyrdom, a* 133

*Politics of service versus politics  
of power* 179

Power, politics of 179

Protest 38

Radhakrishna 41

Ranga, N.G. 208

Rangachari, K. 283

Rao, P. Kodanda 217

Roser, John R. 113

Rattan, Ram 34

Revolution, nonviolent 141

Rithamowany, M. 44

Satyagraha 34

School: the sacred cow 296

Sen, Mohit 290

Service, politics of 179

Shah, A.B. 219

Shah, Manabhai 46

Shukla, S. 49

Social change 304

Socialism 184

*Some characteristics of Gandhi's  
thought* 190

Subrahmanyam, K. 33

Subramaniam, C. 34

Subramanyam, Ka Naa 213

Symposium 6, 184, 261

Thapar, Romesh 214

*Tropic of silence, the* 167

Trust society, the 113

*Towards a counter-civilisation* 283

Tripathi, S.D. 311

Trustship management 311

Tyabji, Badrud-din 292

Umaitha, T.K.N. 304

Wallace, Michael D. 226

*What is the most worthwhile work?*  
167

*Yet lingering curse, the* 257

# IN BACK NUMBERS

1963

January

- William R. Miller : Gandhi and  
Rusg—Pioneers of Modern  
Nonviolence  
T.K. Mahadevan : An Approach to  
the Study of Gandhi  
S. Varma : The Four Noble Truths  
of Gandhi's Social Philosophy

April

- A Controversy : The Meaning of  
Gandhi  
Robert Payne : The Inheritance of  
Gandhi  
Itzhak De Sole Pool : Violence in  
Villages  
Stuart Nelson : Caste and Un-  
touchability—and Gandhi

July

- R.R. Diwekar : The Lokamanya and  
the Mahatma  
Bhabani Bhattacharya : Some Re-  
fections on Gandhi the Writer  
Ema Wynne-Tyson : Gandhi and  
the God-Idea  
S. M. Thearl : Four Questions on  
Gandhi's Philosophy

October

- Jayaprakash Narayan : Gandhi and  
Social Revolution  
A.S. Deshpande : Gandhian Social  
Philosophy  
Resolving Scheme : The Obligations  
of the Individual  
B. Lytle : Gandhi's Personality as  
a Source of his Influence

1970

January

- Donald H. Bishop : Gandhism and  
Discent in America  
George Luky : Strategy for Non-  
Violent Revolution  
James E. Bristol : The Draft Re-  
sist Movement in the United  
States  
Johanna Bosch : Erkkosa's Gandhi

April

- T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Adulthood  
of Mahatma Gandhi  
K. G. Sulydain : Gandhi's Loveable  
Personality  
P. Nagareja Rao : The Gandhian  
Concept of Dharma  
Lyn Bowman : Tolstarianism or  
Nonviolence?

July

- Paul F. Power : Gandhi's View of  
Citizenship  
K. Santhanam : Gandhi's Way of  
Life  
R. R. Diwekar : Dynamics of  
Ahimsa  
Gene Sharp : Gandhi as a National  
Defence Strategist

October

- Grant Code : The Gums : 1914-1968  
James D. Hunt : Thoreau and  
Gandhi : A Re-revelation of  
the Legacy  
T. K. Mahadevan : Gandhi Study in  
the Seventies  
T. K. N. Unnikrishnan : Gandhian View  
of a World Social Order

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI

1971

January

William L. Richter : Gandhi and Language : Political Relevance for the Seventies

Stuart Nelson : Nonviolence and India's Independence

Ija Lazari-Peulowska : Principles of Gandhi's Public Activity

April

James W. Douglass : The Revolution is the Kingdom

James Warren Gould : The Alternative to War

N. G. S. Kori : Techniques and Tools of Gandhian Revolution

K. Gupteewar : Gandhi's Views on Law and Justice

July

Gerald Hurwitz : The Idea of a Mass Deontic Movement

Johan Galtung : Peace Research

C. N. Patel : Erikson's Gandhi

V. V. Ramana Murti : Gandhi and Nehru : Dialogue to Debate

October

Kanak Khanna : Individualistic Trends in Gandhian Thought

Edwin King : Lohia and the U. S. Civil Rights Movement

Charles C. Walker : Nonviolent Action and the U. S. Navy

Ramakrishnareo Vatsya : Gandhi and Technical Education

1972

January

G. Tucci : A Meditation on Donald H. Bishop : The Principles of Nonviolence

Manoranjan Jha : Gandhi, Disobedience and Officials

R.S. Mookhaadiker : The Tradition of Resistance in Ancient India

April

Symposium : India After Dash

Homer A. Jack : The Indian Crisis at the U.N.

W. L. Gargas Jr. : Thoughts on the Road to Stockholm

Marie B. Byles : Needful Beings : Violence and Nonviolence

July

Lewis Mumford : The Pentagon's Power

James Warren Gould : The Role of Nonviolence in Social Change

R. R. Diwakar : Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy : Its Universal Dimensions

James W. Douglass : The Yang of Resistance and the Yin of Accommodation

October

Maurice Friedman : The Limits of Otherness and the Quest for Peace

James E. Brissett : Nonviolence First for Export

James J. Preston : Religious and Political Processes in Gandhi's Thought

GANDHI MARG  
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION  
NEW DELHI